To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Shamsuddin bin Ahmad entitled "A Comparison of Tennessee Rural and Urban Counties Regarding 32 Problem Areas as Perceived by Selected Community Leaders." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Extension.

Cecil E. Carter, Jr., Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Shawn Pew

Date Feb. 12, 1986

A COMPARISON OF TENNESSEE RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED COMMUNITY LEADERS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Shamsuddin bin Ahmad

March 1986

AG-VET-MED.
Thesis
86
.A452

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation and gratitude to his graduate committee members; Dr. Cecil E. Carter, Jr., Dr. George F. Smith and Dr. Lewis H. Dickson for their guidance, advice and assistance throughout this study.

Appreciation is also expressed to David Kelly Amonett for his permission to reproduce data from his thesis for comparing 1979 with 1984 regarding 28 community problem areas as perceived by all 12 groups of leaders in rural and urban counties.

Appreciation is also extended to the late Dr. Robert S. Dotson for his initial encouragement and understanding.

Finally, the writer wishes to express special appreciation to a number of friends, his parents and his family, Ainul, Hana and Hani for their patience, support and encouragement.

ABSTRACT

The general purpose of this study was to identify differences and similarities between Tennessee's rural and urban counties as to leaders' perceptions of the quality of 32 selected community problem areas.

The data were obtained in 1984 through a statewide mail survey of community leaders. The samples were taken from the county leaders belonging to 12 groups which included bankers, the County Agricultural Extension Committee, county government officials, the County Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, merchants, ministers, newspaper editors, school principals, Service Club Presidents, and Senior 4-H Club Presidents. A total of 4616 county leaders returned the survey.

Tennessee counties were divided into rural and urban according to the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area classification.

The data were analyzed by computer facilities provided by The University of Tennessee, Knoxville Computing Center. The Chi-Square Test was used to test the significance of the differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties regarding the selected community problem areas.

Major findings of the study included the following:

1. Rural and urban counties differed as rated by all 12 groups of leaders on 27 areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, local stores, sources of credit, fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, police protection, public buildings, public

transportation, road maintenance, sewage disposal, children's day care, condition of homes, family income, family living conditions, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, public libraries, school buildings, citizen participation in local government, community organizations, general community appearance, land use planning and zoning, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunities for all ages). Rural county leaders regarded the quality or condition of one area (sewage disposal) higher than did urban county leaders; whereas, urban county leaders rated the other 26 areas higher than did rural county leaders.

2. Rural and urban counties differed as rated by five Extension-related audiences on 14 areas (jobs available, job training and re-training, local industry, local stores, public buildings, children's day care, family income, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, school buildings, general community appearance, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunities for all ages). Urban county leaders rated each of the 14 areas higher than did rural county leaders.

3. Rural and urban counties differed as rated by leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences on 27 areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, local stores, fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, police protection, public buildings, public transportation, road maintenance, sewage disposal, children's day care, condition of homes, family income, family living conditions, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, nursing homes, public libraries,

school buildings, citizen participation in local government, community organizations, general community appearance, land use planning and zoning, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunities for all ages). Rural counties were rated higher than urban counties as to the quality or condition of sewage disposal and nursing homes; whereas, urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on the other 25 areas.

4. The ratings of rural counties by all 12 groups of leaders in 1979 compared with 1984 differed as to the quality of 25 community problem areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local agriculture, local stores, local industry, fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, public transportation, road maintenance, sewage disposal, water supply, condition of homes, family income, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, availability of public health services, education, nursing homes, public libraries, school buildings, community organizations, conservation of natural resources, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunities for all ages). Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 as to the quality or condition of eight areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local agriculture, local stores, local industry, family income, public transportation, and conservation of natural resources); whereas, rural counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on the other 17 areas.

The ratings of urban counties by all 12 groups of leaders in 1979 compared with 1984 differed as to the quality of 19 community problem areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local stores,

local industry, fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, public transportation, road maintenance, sewage disposal, condition of homes, family living conditions, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, nursing homes, public libraries, school buildings, and community organizations). Urban counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 as to the quality or condition of four areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, and public transportation); whereas, urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on the other 15 areas.

5. Rural and urban counties were rated most frequently as poor on public transportation; whereas, local agriculture, sources of credit, water supply, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, nursing homes, and public libraries were rated most frequently as good by all groups of audiences surveyed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background of the Study	1
	Need for the Study	3
	Purpose of the Study	3
	Limitations	4
	Definition of Terms	5
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES	7
	Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Business, Industry and Employment	8
	Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Community Facilities and Services	9
	Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Family Living	11
	Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Health and Education	14
	Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Recreation and General Community Environment	17
	Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties as to Their Sense of Well Being and Community Satisfaction	19
III.	METHOD OF PROCEDURE	21
	Population	21
	Sample	21
	Data Collection	22
IV.	COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY 12 GROUPS OF LEADERS	24
	Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Business, Industry and Employment	24
	Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Community Facilities and Services	30
	Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Family Living	34
	Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Health and Education	37
	Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Recreational and General Community Environment	40

CHAPTER PAGE

V. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY FIVE GROUPS OF EXTENSION-RELATED AUDIENCES. 46
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Business, Industry and Employment 46
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Community Facilities and Services 56
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Family Living 61
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Health and Education. 64
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Recreational and General Community Environment. 69

VI. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY NON-EXTENSION-RELATED LEADERS 75
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Business, Industry and Employment 75
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Community Facilities and Services 81
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Family Living 85
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Health and Education. 88
Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties as to the Quality of Recreational and General Community Environment 91

VII. COMPARISON BETWEEN 1979 AND 1984 LEADERS' RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 28 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY 12 GROUPS OF LEADERS. . . . 97
Comparison of 1979 with 1984 as to the Quality of Business, Industry and Employment in Rural and Urban Counties 97
Comparison of 1979 with 1984 as to the Quality of Community Facilities and Services in Rural and Urban Counties 103
Comparison of 1979 with 1984 as to the Quality of Family Living in Rural and Urban Counties. 105
Comparison of 1979 with 1984 as to the Quality of Health and Education in Rural and Urban Counties . . 107
Comparison of 1979 with 1984 as to the Quality of Recreational and General Community Environment in Rural and Urban Counties. 108

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. SUMMARY 112
Purpose and Specific Objectives 112
Method of Investigation 113
Major Findings. 114
Implications. 127
Recommendations 129
Recommendation for Further Study. 130

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 131

APPENDIX. 135

VITA. 137

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Extension work is "an out-of-school system of education in which adults and young people learn by doing" (12:1).* Since Extension work was funded by the Congress in 1914 with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act, Community Resource Development (CRD) has become one of the important Extension program areas (21:1). The other three Extension responsibilities are in the areas of agricultural production, home economics (for the homemakers) and youth organization especially the 4-H program.

Traditionally, the Extension's CRD programs have been aimed at rural communities. The CRD's broad objective is ". . . to improve community services and institutions . . ." and ". . . to increase the quality of life in rural America" (9:1). Various programs and acts are implemented to stress the importance and to achieve the objectives of CRD. Programs such as the Land Use and Planning, the Rural Development Program, the Rural Area Development Program, and the Rural Development Act of 1972 (21:1) are tailored for this purpose.

Today, CRD has a wide range of activities in the areas of people development, economic development, community organization and facilities, and environmental improvement in rural and urban areas (19:1).

---

*Numbers in parenthesis refer to alphabetically listed items in the Bibliography; those after the colon are page numbers.

The constant changing of rural areas and the community itself has brought many changes to Extension's CRD program. The urbanization of rural areas and the migration of people affect the community in many ways. The urban-rural migration is a new trend occurring in the United States. This trend of rural migration is illustrated by a more rapid growth in non-metropolitan areas than of metropolitan areas (2:44). In a four year period, 1970 to 1974, the population of non-metropolitan counties grew by 5.6 percent, whereas the growth rate was 3.4 percent in metropolitan counties (10:50).

This rural living trend requires the improvement of rural life-styles (28:2). However, this rural renaissance trend is reversing back to the higher growth of urban population than rural during 1980 to 1984 as found by the Census Bureau's latest study (25).

The rural and urban migration trend ultimately will combine rural and urban communities to become a mass society. Improved linkages, the breakdown of isolation and improved mass communication are the other factors that will homogenize rural and urban communities (20:8).

In fact, the mass society in some parts of the United States has become a reality. The merging characteristics of this mass society are quite different from either rural or urban society. The rural-urban differences in values (20:8), community relationships (20:259), attitudinal, religious and behavioral differences have decreased or nearly disappeared. But, what about differences in the areas of local concern that once were characteristic of either rural or urban sub-culture? Are these indicators of the quality of life disappearing with

the merging of values, relationships, attitudinal and behavioral differences of rural and urban people?

This is the issue of this study, to find if there are any perception differences occurring in the areas of local concern between Tennessee rural and urban communities, and if so, how they differ.

II. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Every county is unique, differing especially in community concerns and problem areas. But, when the counties are divided into dichotomous rural and urban sectors, their status of community problem areas may be the same or differ significantly as perceived by community leaders.

Indirectly, this study will help local change agents share experiences with other counties' agents which should be helpful in planning future program strategy.

The comparison of 1979 with 1984 regarding 28 common community problem areas as perceived by all 12 groups of leaders in rural and in urban counties hopefully will assist agents in evaluating local CRD programs. To some extent, this last part of the study helps to evaluate the success of CRD programs and will provide a benchmark for evaluating future programs.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The general purpose was to identify differences and similarities between Tennessee's rural and urban counties as to leaders' perceptions of the quality of 32 selected community problem areas.

The more specific objectives were divided into four categories. While the first three specific objectives were limited to data obtained in 1984, the fourth and last objective was related to data obtained in 1979 and 1984. The specific objectives were to compare rural and urban counties with regard to the ratings of 32 problem areas as perceived by:

1. All 12 groups of leaders,
2. Five groups of leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences,
3. All of the non-Extension-related audiences.

The fourth objective was to compare 1979 with 1984 regarding 28 common community problem areas as perceived by all 12 groups of leaders in rural and in urban counties.

IV. LIMITATIONS

The scope of the first three objectives in this study was limited to data gathered in the 1984 CRD statewide survey. The survey was conducted by the Tennessee Agriculture Extension Service (TAES) in the summer of 1984. The last objective of this study was related to both the 1979 and 1984 CRD surveys.

There were 31 predetermined community problem areas in the 1979 CRD survey and 32 in the 1984 CRD survey. Selection of the problem areas and development of survey checklists were done by specialists at TAES. These community problem areas serve as measurements for assessing the quality of life in a community (27:2).

The distinction of rural and urban counties in this study was based on place of residence. They were assumed to be the same as

non-metropolitan and metropolitan counties as defined by the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). The terms rural-urban and non-metropolitan--metropolitan were considered the same and can be used interchangeable without serious misinterpretation (6:55).

In the 1984 CRD statewide survey, 22 SMSA counties were categorized as urban and 72 non-SMSA counties as rural. The urban counties were: Anderson, Blount, Carter, Cheatham, Davidson, Dickson, Hamilton, Hawkins, Knox, Marion, Montgomery, Robertson, Rutherford, Sequatchie, Shelby, Sullivan, Sumner, Tipton, Union, Washington, Williamson, and Wilson.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Extension-Related Audience. The term is used in reference to the five groups of county leaders which are working closely with Extension Service in Community Development. The leaders' groups are: County Agricultural Extension Committee, County Rural Development Committee, Community Club President, Home Demonstration Club President, and Senior 4-H Club President.

2. Community Resource Development (CRD). Is an Extension educational process of working with people for the social and economic benefit of the community.

3. Leaders. Selected people holding formal job responsibilities who are responsible for decision making in their respective areas. Their actions in some way affect the community in general.

4. Non-Extension Related Audiences. Refers to seven groups of county leaders, which traditionally are not in a close working contact

with the Extension Service. The seven groups of leaders include: bankers, county government officials, merchants, ministers, newspaper editors, school principals, and service club presidents.

5. Rural. Is defined as a geographical area which is not located in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Non-SMSA is also called non-metropolitan area.

6. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). It is a statistical standard designed by the Office of Management and Budget. An SMSA includes: (1) a city with 50,000 residents and the county in which the city is located, or (2) a city with at least 25,000 residents combined with the adjacent area or county of at least 50,000 or more in population.

7. Urban. A term used to define all geographical areas included in SMSA. A SMSA member is also called a metropolitan area.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

Numerous studies have been done to explore rural and urban differences in Community Resource Development. Most of the studies reviewed in this chapter are related to the status of selected community areas of concern as perceived by the residents or researched by the authors. Only one study (Amonett), was found to be directly related to the perception of community areas of concern by rural and urban leaders.

The main purpose of this chapter is to review the perceptions and the rating differences and similarities of selected CRD areas of concern. To facilitate the review, this chapter is divided into the following six sections:

1. Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Business, Industry and Employment.

2. Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Community Facilities and Services.

3. Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Family Living.

4. Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Health and Education.

5. Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to the Status of Recreational and General Community Environment.

6. Comparison of Rural and Urban Counties as to their Sense of Well-Being and Community Satisfaction.

I. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES WITH REGARD TO THE STATUS OF BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT

Amonett (1:36-39) in a comparison study found that in 1979, local Tennessee agriculture was rated good by leaders in both rural and urban counties. In the areas of local industry, local stores, source of credit, jobs availability and family income, there were significant differences between leaders' ratings of rural and urban counties. Urban counties were rated much higher than rural counties.

In a study to compare rural-urban differences in community satisfaction, Johnson and Knop (15:544-548) found that urban residents were more satisfied with shopping facilities and employment opportunities than were the rural residents. They suggested that satisfaction was a multidimensional variable.

The satisfaction of urban residents in the areas of shopping facilities and employment opportunities was supported by Donald J. Bogue and Calvin L. Beale (5:118). They reported that American business focused more on metropolitan areas rather than non-metropolitan areas. As a result, those areas of concern were rated much higher in metropolitan areas.

Hayes and Dunkelberger (24:1-4) conducted a study to explore the aspirations of rural youths in Alabama. They found that the majority of their sample was employed. The occupations were broken down into 35.8 percent in professional, technical and managerial occupations, 30.0 percent in clerical and craftman jobs, 28.2 percent in low or limited skill jobs, and 1.4 percent in farming.

The trend of industry moving to rural areas has a lot to do with the cheaper labor, lower taxes, and less rigid zoning laws, as reported by Rogers and Burdge (20:390-391). They also suggested that rural unemployment and underemployment were still the biggest problems since mechanization took place on the farm.

Zuiches (10:62) reported that during 1950 to 1975 the difference in the percentage of white-collar occupations between metropolitan residents and non-metropolitan residents was slightly reduced.

In brief, the selected areas with regard to business, industry and employment are perceived as less adequate in rural areas than in urban areas. Even though there is a trend of industry moving to rural areas, the problems of unemployment and underemployment are still prevalent. The rural agriculture industry only employs a small proportion of the rural labor force.

II. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES WITH REGARD TO THE STATUS OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

According to Amonett (1:44-47), no differences occurred between leaders' ratings of sewage disposal and transportation status in rural and urban areas. Approximately the same percentage of leaders rated the two areas as being good.

However, urban counties were rated higher than rural counties in the areas of water supply, fire control, road maintenance, and public buildings. The proportion of leaders who rated the areas as being good were higher in urban than in rural counties.

Furthermore, the highest percentage of leaders in urban counties rated the status of water supply and fire control as being good, while the highest percentage of leaders in rural counties rated them as being fair. The status of road maintenance was rated poor in rural counties and fair in urban counties.

In a study of rural government and local public services, Rainey (10:36) found that inadequate manpower was the typical problem facing rural law enforcement services.

Comparatively poor fire protection services also contributed to higher fire losses in the rural areas than in urban areas. In addition, the fire insurance premiums in rural areas were higher than in urban areas to compensate for the greater fire risk.

Miller and Crader (18:489-504) in 1979 conducted a relationship study between satisfaction and county spending preferences among community leaders and community residents in rural Alabama. They found that leaders and residents were at the same level of satisfaction in the areas of water service and garbage disposal service. However, the residents wanted the county to spend more on garbage disposal service while the leaders wanted to spend more on law enforcement services. This study showed that both leaders and residents were having difficulties in establishing priority due to differences in satisfaction of the local services.

Rogers and Burdge (20:39) reported that rural local government services could be better if there were more cooperation between local governments. They also reported that the typical rural local government was resistant to change.

According to Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) the rural crime rate was much lower than in urban areas. In 1974, 11 murder cases occurred in metropolitan areas and only 8 in non-metropolitan areas per 100,000 people. In non-metropolitan areas, aggravated assaults numbered 112 while the number of robberies was 20, compared with 243 and 274, respectively in metropolitan areas. Urban areas also have a high rate of property crime, such as burglary, larceny-theft and motor vehicle theft. The police in rural areas were also more successful in solving crimes compared to urban police.

On the whole, the status of some selected areas of concern with regard to community facilities and services in rural areas is behind its urban counterpart. Some of the reasons suggested are the lack of manpower and inefficiency of local government.

III. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES WITH REGARD TO THE STATUS OF FAMILY LIVING

Amonett (1) found significant differences between the ratings of rural and urban counties as to family living conditions, family income and conditions of homes. For the three areas, the urban leaders' ratings of urban counties were higher than the rural ratings.

According to Carlson, Lasey and Lasey (6:70), a majority of federal housing funds went to metropolitan areas while lower quality housing was found in rural areas where 59 percent of rural housing had inadequate kitchen facilities.

In a news article, Herbers (22:F1 and F6) reported that about 4.5 million rural houses were inadequate. Congress, which recently

reduced the budget for Farmers' Home Administration by 41 percent, literally cut needed rural housing aid. High interest rates, increased prices of building materials, a depressed agricultural economy, and increased foreclosure rates on home mortgages will create a wider gap between rural and urban housing. In some parts of rural America, people are living in mobile homes as an alternative to more expensive permanent housing.

Fitzsimmons and Freedman (11:17) also reported that rural housing was far behind its urban counterpart. Even though rural residents make up only 26 percent of the United States' population, 44 percent of the inadequate housing is located in the rural areas.

According to Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129), even though non-metropolitan home ownership was 70 percent compared to 60 percent for metropolitan residents, their median property value was only $12,200 compared to $19,000 for metropolitan residents in 1970. Non-metropolitan housing also faced overcrowding problems. There was an average of 3.32 people per house in non-metropolitan areas compared to 3.04 people per house in metropolitan areas.

Beegle, Bryant and Hathaway (3:197-198) reported that the median income of rural residents in the United States was below the median income of urban residents. This pattern has persisted for several decades without any changes. This difference was due to the low percentage of persons employed and the low average income of rural residents. The gap was greater and more obvious in the southern states.

Fitzsimmons and Freedman (11:17) reported that in the late 1970's, rural residents' incomes were catching up with the income of urban

residents. During that time, rural residents' incomes were about 80 percent of urban residents' incomes.

Surprisingly, Johnson and Knop (15:544-548) in their study found that rural residents were more satisfied with their salary scale than were the urban residents.

During the years 1950 to 1975, Zuiches (10:62) reported that there was a slight reduction in median family income differences between metropolitan and non-metropolitan residents in the United States.

As reported by Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) in 1969 the average national family income was $9,590, with $7,615 for non-metropolitan families and $10,406 for metro families.

Larson (10:104) reported that 75 percent of rural residents were contented with their standard of living and housing situation. Sixty-seven percent were satisfied with their family income and 82 percent to 90 percent were satisfied with the work they were doing.

In 1967, Mugge and Eppley (4:46) reported that the United States' urban residents received more child welfare services (86.6 percent) than did rural residents (69.8 percent). The lack of public welfare in rural areas was more critical for the minorities and poverty stricken residents. They were often rejected or neglected by the welfare services.

On the whole, the situation of urban family living is far better than its rural counterpart. One of the several mentioned areas with regard to family living, the condition of houses, is more serious and creates a real problem in rural areas.

IV. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES WITH REGARD TO THE STATUS OF HEALTH AND EDUCATION

Amonett (1) found there was no significant difference between leaders' ratings of public health facilities in rural and urban counties. Of the rural counties, 46.4 percent of the leaders rated it as being fair and 45.9 percent rated it as being good. Whereas, 49.7 percent of leaders rated public health facilities in urban counties as being good and 43.3 percent rated it as being fair.

Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban public libraries, education, school buildings, availability of doctors and dentists, hospital and clinics and nursing homes. Leaders rated all the six of these facilities higher in urban counties than in rural counties.

Lupidi (24:2), in 1979 reported that according to the U.S.D.A., rural areas were in great need of public health services. In addition to a high rate of work related accidents and lack of comprehensive health care approaches, there were not enough physicians or health facilities. Lupidi also found significant differences in health-related perceptions between rural Appalachian and non-rural Appalachian residents in Ohio. They differed in perception of health status, preventive health practices, morbidity, and general health knowledge. However, the differences were getting narrower.

Rogers (20:391) and Tweeter (26:26) agreed that health was a major social problem in rural areas. According to Fitzsimmons and Freedman (11:17), the per capita ratio of physicians in rural areas

was only 40 percent of the urban per capita ratio. Farm workers were more prone to accidents, while the health services and facilities were inferior and in short supply compared to their urban counterparts.

Benjamin and Bright (25:5) in another study, found that significant differences occurred between town and country residents in rural areas in access to health care resources and time spent in obtaining medical care. They found that a high percentage of country residents perceived the high cost of transportation and lack of physicians were the major barriers to health care.

Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) also reported that health care in rural areas was inadequate in every aspect, whereas their need for medical attention was much higher than that of urban residents. Rural areas had a higher rate of chronic diseases, more sick leaves, greater work related injuries, higher morbidity and mortality incidents. The average trip to a doctor was 4.8 visits for non-metropolitan residents. On the average, areas with a population of less than 10,000 people had only one doctor per 2,103 residents for rural areas, whereas there was one doctor for every 450 residents in a large metropolitan area.

In education, Beegle, Bryant and Hathaway (3:144-145) reported that rural residents were still behind urban residents in school enrollment. In educational attainment, in 1960, Bogue and Beale (5:102) reported that urban adults averaged 11.1 years of schooling compared to 9.5 years for rural non-farm adults and 8.8 years for rural farm adults. In 1970, Sanders (23:103) reported that urban residents' average years of schooling was 12.2 years, rural non-farm was 11.2 years

and rural farm was 10.7 years. The data show that the rural-urban differences in educational attainment have been getting narrower.

Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) also reported that educational attainment by the most rural residents, which averaged 9.9 years, was far behind that of urban residents. They also reported that the rural high school drop-out rate between the age of 16 to 17 years was higher. It was 15.2 percent for the rural residents, 13.6 percent for non-metropolitan residents and 9.5 percent for metropolitan residents in 1970. Rural areas also were lacking in vocational and other post high school educational opportunities.

In 1979, Sonderberg and Dunkelberger (24:5-11) conducted a study in Alabama to compare metropolitan and non-metropolitan students by achievement tests. They found a significant difference in cumulative means scores between the two groups of students. Metropolitan students scored higher than non-metropolitan students and the gap widened as the grade levels increased. They also found that for both groups of students the achievement scores were positively related to teacher's salaries and school expenditure per student.

Hayres and Dunkelberger (24:1-4) in a study in rural Alabama, learned from 280 youths averaging 29 years old, that only one quarter had failed to complete some kind of post high school training. The rest had been trained mostly in vocational and business schools or had received a two-year associate degree.

Performance of rural school students was also reported to be below urban standards by Fitzsimmons and Freedman (11:21) The educational deficiency of rural students was found in every measure of

educational skills. They also reported that minorities were the less fortunate groups of students in rural areas. In 1975, 30 percent of the black and Hispanic males in the United States were functionally illiterate.

In general, the problem of health is more serious in rural areas than in urban areas. Even though health services in rural areas are improving, specific services such as availability of doctors and dentists, hospitals, clinics, and nursing homes are still lacking. Education is better in urban areas than in rural areas. In every measure of education, urban areas received significantly higher ratings.

V. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES WITH REGARD TO THE STATUS OF RECREATION AND GENERAL COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT

With regard to recreational and general community environment, Amonett (1) found significant differences between the leaders' ratings of rural and urban counties as to general appearance of roads, parks and streets, parks and playgrounds and recreational opportunities. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties in each of these areas.

No significant differences were found between the ratings of rural and urban counties as to land use planning and conservation of soil, water and timber.

In general, Carlson, Lasey and Lasey (6:69-70) indicate that rural areas have better environmental quality than urban areas. There are more trees, open green spaces and accessible natural recreation sites, whereas urban recreational activities are mostly done indoors.

Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) also reported that rural areas have better environmental quality than urban areas. The environment is more beautiful and the air is cleaner. Urban residents have a greater chance of being exposed to high levels of air and noise pollution.

Johnson and Knop (15:544-548) in their study of community satisfaction found that the rural community was more satisfied with their general geographical surroundings and with the local democratic process than was the urban community.

Wilkening (10:20) reported that pollution occurring in rural areas originated in urban centers. Urban industries and energy plants essential to urban growth produced most of the rural environmental problems.

Lowe and Pinkey (16:114-128), in a study to find rural-urban differences in support of environmental protection, found that rural residents were less supportive than urban residents.

In general, rural residents, as reported by Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129), have less leisure time. They reported that rural residents only have 91 activity days per year for recreation compared to 97 activity days per year for urban residents. The recreational activities of rural residents were mostly done outdoors, whereas urban residents' recreational activities were mostly done in developed indoor facilities.

In summary, recreational and general community environment is better in rural areas than it is in urban areas. However, rural residents spent less time enjoying this advantage compared to the time spent by urban residents.

VI. COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THEIR SENSE OF WELL BEING AND COMMUNITY SATISFACTION

In general, Carlson, Lasey and Lasey (6:73) reported that rural people were more satisfied with their community compared to urban people. This was supported by Larson (10:104). He reported that rural residents scored higher in level of satisfaction in the quality of life than urban residents. More than 80 percent of rural residents were satisfied with their quality of life.

Among the elderly residents, Hynson (13:64-66) found that the rural elderly were more satisfied with their community, showing greater general happiness and less fear than the urban elderly.

There were two dimensions of community satisfaction, according to Miller and Crader (18:489-504); economic and interpersonal. They found that in general rural residents showed a higher level of interpersonal satisfaction than urban residents. The interpersonal satisfaction was related to self, family and friends, including beliefs and values. On the other hand, economic satisfaction of urban residents was higher than that of rural residents.

Among the rural residents, Jeser (14:56-59) considered that "technical helping" professionals (lawyers, doctors and dentists) were more satisfied than "social helping" professionals (teachers and clergymen).

Community satisfaction was found to be related to community size in few studies. Davies (7:246-255), Jesser (14:56-69) and Johnson and Knop (15:544-548) found a positive relationship between community

satisfaction and community size. Davies also found that community satisfaction was not related to sex and age, and only moderately related to intelligence. Johnson and Knop concluded that urban communities were more satisfied with their specialized services and opportunities.

Dillman and Tremblay (8:115-129) reported that while a rural American's quality of life was behind an urbanite's, as measured objectively in the areas of economics, getting services and facilities, it was actually better off as measured by material and social environment. They also suggested that the rural quality of life was low and inadequate compared to its urban counterpart.

In summary, rural residents are more satisfied with their community than are urban residents. However, urban residents are more satisfied with their economy and specific services and opportunities than are rural residents. Even though rural quality of life when measured objectively is lower than its urban counterpart, rural residents are more satisfied with their community.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

I. POPULATION

The population of this study included county leaders belonging to 12 groups of community leaders living in 94 Tennessee counties.

II. SAMPLE

The selected county leaders, their recommended sample size for each county and the numbers of leaders responding for each leader group are listed below:

1. Bankers (all, number of respondents 327),
2. County Agricultural Extension Committee (all, number of respondents 338),
3. County Government Officials (judges and four officials, number of respondents 337),
4. County Rural Development Committee (all, number of respondents 526),
5. Community Club Presidents (all, number of respondents 143),
6. Home Demonstration Club Presidents (all, number of respondents 729),
7. Merchants (five representatives, number of respondents 278),
8. Ministers (five representatives, number of respondents 252),
9. Newspaper Editors (all, number of respondents 106),
10. School Principals (all, number of respondents 526),

11. Service Club Presidents (all, number of respondents 335),

12. Senior 4-H Club Presidents (all, number of respondents 136).

There were 583 responses which were not identified. A total of 4616 questionnaires were returned from the 94 counties.

III. DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected from the leaders by the County Extension agents through mail questionnaires in the summer of 1984 (see Appendix). Complete questionnaires were returned to the appropriate county agents and were then mailed to the District Supervisors. From there the questionnaires were sent to the Agricultural Economic and Resource Development Section of TAES for further processing.

Instrument

The 1984 CRD survey questionnaire was developed by specialists at the TAES. There were 32 areas of local concern in the questionnaire. The leaders were asked to rate each area on the scale of good, fair and poor as they believed the average residents see the areas.

Data Processing

The data were processed by specialists in the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service and entered into the computer. The data were then divided into rural and urban according to leaders' counties of residence. Rural counties were those classified as non-SMSA and urban counties as SMSA.

Analysis

Comparisons were made between rural and urban county leaders' ratings of 32 selected community problem areas by examining the numbers and percentages of the ratings (good, fair and poor). The Chi-Square Test was used to test the significance of the differences between the ratings of rural and urban counties. Probability of achieving the 0.05 level was considered significant.

CHAPTER IV

COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY 12 GROUPS OF LEADERS

This chapter presents the findings of the study related to the first specific objective, which was to compare rural and urban counties with regard to the ratings of 32 problem areas as perceived by all 12 groups of leaders

The findings are presented in five sections according to the five groups of community problem areas which are: (1) business, industry and employment, (2) community facilities and services, (3) family living, (4) health and education, and (5) recreational and general community environment.

Ratings of each community problem area reported in Table I were done by all leaders in rural and urban counties. The purpose was to compare leaders' ratings of rural and urban counties. The Chi-Square Test was used to compare the significance of the differences between the leaders' ratings (good, fair and poor) of 32 community problem areas in rural and urban counties.

I. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT

Six community problem areas are included in this section: (1) jobs available, (2) job training and retraining, (3) local agriculture, (4) local industry, (5) local stores, and (6) sources of credit.

TABLE I

LEADERS' RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS

Problem Areas	Rural Counties N	Rural Counties %	Urban Counties N	Urban Counties %
Business, Industry and Employment				
Jobs Available				
Good	270	7.8	187	17.2
Fair	1530	44.3	597	55.0
Poor	1658	48.0	301	27.7
Total	3458	100.0	1085	100.0
	χ^2 - 171.64		p - 0.000	
Job Training and Retraining				
Good	395	11.6	170	16.4
Fair	1554	45.6	569	55.0
Poor	1459	42.8	296	28.6
Total	3408	100.0	1035	100.0
	χ^2 - 69.80		p - 0.000	
Local Agriculture				
Good	1934	56.0	633	58.8
Fair	1421	41.1	413	38.4
Poor	99	2.9	30	2.8
Total	3454	100.0	1076	100.0
	χ^2 - 2.72		p - 0.256	
Local Industry				
Good	957	27.6	473	43.7
Fair	1645	47.5	479	44.2
Poor	862	24.9	131	12.1
Total	3464	100.0	1083	100.0
	χ^2 - 131.23		p - 0.000	
Local Stores				
Good	1144	33.0	603	55.6
Fair	1826	52.3	407	37.5
Poor	503	14.5	75	6.9
Total	3473	100.0	1085	100.0
	χ^2 - 187.25		p - 0.000	
Sources of Credit				
Good	1873	54.8	639	60.7
Fair	1340	39.2	376	35.7
Poor	204	6.0	38	3.6
Total	3417	100.0	1053	100.0
	χ^2 - 15.81		p - 0.000	
Community Facilities and Services				
Fire Protection				
Good	1386	40.1	575	58.8
Fair	1544	44.7	413	37.9
Poor	525	15.2	101	9.3
Total	3455	100.0	1089	100.0
	χ^2 - 60.74		p - 0.000	
Garbage and Trash Disposal				
Good	1207	35.0	455	41.9
Fair	1577	45.7	473	43.6
Poor	670	19.4	158	14.6
Total	3454	100.0	1086	100.0
	χ^2 - 22.37		p - 0.000	
Police Protection				
Good	1262	36.5	456	41.8
Fair	1763	51.0	534	49.0
Poor	431	12.5	100	9.2
Total	3456	100.0	1090	100.0
	χ^2 - 14.58		p - 0.001	
Public Buildings				
Good	1297	37.3	535	49.2
Fair	1840	53.0	491	45.2
Poor	338	9.7	61	5.6
Total	3475	100.0	1087	100.0
	χ^2 - 55.01		p - 0.000	
Public Transportation				
Good	232	6.9	111	10.7
Fair	951	28.5	345	33.3
Poor	2160	64.6	580	56.0
Total	3343	100.0	1036	100.0
	χ^2 - 30.09		p - 0.000	

TABLE I (Continued)

Problem Areas	Rural Counties N	Rural Counties %	Urban Counties N	Urban Counties %
Road Maintenance				
Good	648	18.7	225	20.7
Fair	2107	60.9	605	55.6
Poor	1087	31.4	259	23.8
Total	3462	100.0	1089	100.0
	X^2 - 23.07		p - 0.000	
Sewage Disposal				
Good	1134	33.7	338	32.1
Fair	1518	45.2	454	43.1
Poor	709	21.1	262	24.9
Total	3361	100.0	1054	100.0
	X^2 - 6.62		p - 0.036	
Water Supply				
Good	2190	63.4	660	60.2
Fair	1001	29.0	344	31.4
Poor	265	7.7	92	8.4
Total	3456	100.0	1096	100.0
	X^2 - 3.53		p - 0.171	
Family Living				
Children's Day Care				
Good	877	26.3	421	40.1
Fair	1687	50.5	513	48.8
Poor	776	23.2	117	11.1
Total	3340	100.0	1051	100.0
	X^2 - 109.53		p - 0.000	
Condition of Homes				
Good	1186	34.4	564	52.4
Fair	2099	60.9	497	46.2
Poor	164	4.8	16	1.5
Total	3449	100.0	1077	100.0
	X^2 - 121.65		p - 0.000	
Family Income				
Good	321	9.3	262	24.3
Fair	2309	67.1	728	67.5
Poor	810	23.6	88	8.2
Total	3440	100.0	1078	100.0
	X^2 - 240.34		p - 0.000	
Family Living Conditions				
Good	1041	30.2	465	43.3
Fair	2272	66.0	590	54.9
Poor	131	3.8	20	1.9
Total	3444	100.0	1075	100.0
	X^2 - 66.89		p - 0.000	
Health and Education				
Availability of Doctors and Dentists				
Good	1869	54.0	811	74.1
Fair	1232	35.6	227	20.8
Poor	361	10.4	56	5.1
Total	3462	100.0	1094	100.0
	X^2 - 140.10		p - 0.000	
Availability of Hospitals and Clinics				
Good	1926	55.4	771	70.9
Fair	1142	32.8	231	21.3
Poor	409	11.8	85	7.8
Total	3477	100.0	1087	100.0
	X^2 - 82.72		p - 0.000	
Availability of Public Health Service				
Good	1671	48.7	518	48.6
Fair	1584	46.1	491	46.1
Poor	179	5.2	57	5.3
Total	3434	100.0	1066	100.0
	X^2 - 0.03		p - 0.985	
Education				
Good	1440	41.5	570	52.2
Fair	1695	48.8	471	43.1
Poor	336	9.7	52	4.8
Total	3471	100.0	1093	100.0
	X^2 - 50.93		p - 0.000	

TABLE I (Continued)

Problem Areas	Rural Counties N	Rural Counties %	Urban Counties N	Urban Counties %
Nursing Homes				
Good	1877	54.7	558	52.6
Fair	1247	36.3	416	39.3
Poor	309	9.0	86	8.1
Total	3433	100.0	1060	100.0
	X^2 - 3.21	p - 0.201		
Public Libraries				
Good	1992	57.4	757	69.5
Fair	1157	33.3	282	25.9
Poor	322	9.3	50	4.6
Total	3471	100.0	1089	100.0
	X^2 - 57.05	p - 0.000		
School Buildings				
Good	1574	45.6	601	55.6
Fair	1506	43.6	439	40.6
Poor	373	10.8	42	3.9
Total	3453	100.0	1082	100.0
	X^2 - 61.94	p - 0.000		
Recreational and General Community Environment				
Citizens Participation in Local Government				
Good	480	13.9	216	20.1
Fair	1866	54.2	587	54.6
Poor	1100	31.9	273	25.4
Total	3446	100.0	1076	100.0
	X^2 - 31.73	p - 0.000		
Community Organizations				
Good	1351	39.1	525	48.6
Fair	1701	49.3	488	45.1
Poor	402	16.6	68	6.3
Total	3454	100.0	1081	100.0
	X^2 - 43.38	p - 0.000		
Conservation of Natural Resources				
Good	783	22.9	273	26.1
Fair	2081	60.8	623	59.6
Poor	558	16.3	150	14.3
Total	3422	100.0	1046	100.0
	X^2 - 5.67	p - 0.059		
General Community Appearance				
Good	1036	30.0	443	41.2
Fair	2056	59.4	566	52.7
Poor	370	10.7	66	6.1
Total	3462	100.0	1075	100.0
	X^2 - 56.14	p - 0.000		
Land Use Planning and Zoning				
Good	525	15.7	199	19.0
Fair	1855	55.5	611	58.2
Poor	964	28.8	240	22.9
Total	3344	100.0	1050	100.0
	X^2 - 16.58	p - 0.000		
Parks and Playgrounds				
Good	1283	37.1	428	39.3
Fair	1267	36.6	478	44.0
Poor	913	26.4	182	16.7
Total	3463	100.0	1088	100.0
	X^2 - 44.76	p - 0.000		
Recreational Opportunities for all Ages				
Good	774	22.3	325	30.1
Fair	1399	40.3	508	47.0
Poor	1296	37.4	247	22.9
Total	3469	100.0	1080	100.0
	X^2 - 80.45	p - 0.000		

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Jobs Available

Jobs available in rural counties appeared to be rated low. The area was rated as poor by 48.0 percent of rural county leaders while only seven and eight-tenths percent rated it as good. However, urban counties were rated fair on jobs available. More than half (55.0 percent) of the leaders in urban counties rated the area as fair while 17.2 percent rated it as good.

Comparison by the use of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of jobs available in rural versus urban counties were significantly different ($p = 0.000$). Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on the availability of jobs.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Job Training and Retraining

Rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to job training and retraining. A majority of leaders in rural (45.6 percent) and urban (55.0 percent) counties rated the area as being fair. Only 11.6 percent and 16.4 percent of rural and urban county leaders, respectively, rated the area as good. Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of job training and retraining in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on job training and retraining.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Agriculture

Rural and urban counties were rated high on local agriculture. The area was rated as being good by more than half of the rural county leaders (56.0 percent) and urban county leaders (58.8 percent).

Comparison by the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of local agriculture in rural versus urban counties were not significantly different ($p = 0.256$). Rural and urban counties were rated equally high with regard to local agriculture.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Industry

Rural counties appeared to be rated fair on local industry. The area was rated fair by a majority (47.5 percent) of rural county leaders. However, urban counties were rated between high and fair on local industry. Approximately the same percentage of urban county leaders (44.0 percent) rated local industry as being good and fair.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of local industry in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher on local industry than were rural counties.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Stores

Local stores in rural counties were rated fair. The area was rated as fair by more than half of rural county leaders (52.3 percent), whereas 33.0 percent of the same audience rated the area as good. However, urban counties were rated high on local stores. A majority of leaders in urban counties rated the area as good (55.6 percent) while 37.5 percent rated it as fair.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test revealed that the ratings of local stores in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than were rural counties with regard to local stores.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Sources of Credit

Rural and urban counties were highly rated with regard to sources of credit. The area was rated as good by a majority of rural and urban county leaders (54.8 percent, rural; 60.7 percent, urban), whereas 39.2 percent and 35.7 percent of rural and urban county leaders, respectively, rated the area as fair.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of sources of credit in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties concerning sources of credit.

Summary Findings: Business, Industry and Employment

Urban counties were rated significantly higher on five out of six areas with regard to business, industry and employment. The areas were: jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, local stores, and sources of credit. However, no significant differences were found between rural and urban counties with regard to local agriculture. Both counties were rated equally high on local agriculture.

II. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

This section is divided into eight community problem areas with regard to community facilities and services. The areas are: (1) fire protection, (2) garbage and trash disposal, (3) police protection, (4) public buildings, (5) public transportation, (6) road maintenance, (7) sewage disposal, and (8) water supply.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Fire Protection

Fire protection in rural counties appeared to be rated between high and fair. About the same proportion of leaders in rural counties rated the area as good (40.1 percent) and as fair (44.7 percent). On the other hand, urban counties were rated high on fire protection. More than half (58.8 percent) of the leaders in urban counties rated fire protection as good while 37.9 percent rated it as fair.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of fire protection in rural and urban counties were significantly different ($p = 0.000$). Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties for fire protection.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Garbage and Trash Disposal

Rural counties appeared to be rated fair on garbage and trash disposal. The majority of leaders in rural counties rated the area as fair (45.7 percent) while 35.0 percent rated it as good. However, urban counties were rated fairly high on garbage and trash disposal. About the same percentage of leaders in urban counties rated the area as being good and fair (41.9 percent, good; 43.6 percent, fair).

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of garbage and trash disposal in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on garbage and trash disposal.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Police Protection

Rural and urban counties in general were rated fair with regard to police protection. The majority (51.0 percent) of leaders in rural counties rated the area as fair while 36.5 percent rated the area as good. The majority (49.0 percent) of urban county leaders rated the area as fair and 41.8 percent rated it as good with regard to police protection.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of police protection in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties for police protection.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Buildings

Rural counties were rated fair concerning public buildings. The area was rated fair by more than half (53.0 percent) of rural county leaders while 37.3 percent rated it as good. However, urban counties appeared to be rated high with regard to public buildings. A majority of urban county leaders (49.2 percent) rated the area as good while 45.2 percent rated it as fair.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of public buildings in rural versus urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on public buildings.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Transportation

Rural and urban counties were rated low on public transportation. The higher percentages of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the

area as being poor (64.6 percent, rural; 56.0 percent, urban). Approximately 7 percent of rural county leaders and 10.7 percent of urban county leaders rated public transportation as good.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of public transportation in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on public transportation.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Road Maintenance

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on road maintenance. The majority of leaders in rural (60.9 percent) and in urban (55.6 percent) counties rated the area as being fair. Less than 20.0 percent of rural county leaders and 20.7 percent of urban county leaders rated road maintenance as good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test revealed that the ratings of road maintenance in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on road maintenance.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Sewage Disposal

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair with regard to sewage disposal. The area was rated fair by 45.2 percent and 43.1 percent of rural and urban county leaders. About the same percentage of leaders in both counties rated the area as good (33.0 percent).

However, the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of sewage disposal in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Rural counties were rated higher than were urban counties on sewage disposal.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Water Supply

Rural and urban counties were rated high on water supply. More than half of rural and urban county leaders rated the area as good (63.4 percent and 60.2 percent, respectively). About the same percentage of rural and urban county leaders rated water supply as fair and as poor.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that no significant differences were found in the ratings of water supply in rural and urban counties. Both counties were rated equally high with regard to water supply.

Summary Findings: Community Facilities and Services

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties on six areas with regard to community facilities and services. The areas were: fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, police protection, public buildings, public transportation, and road maintenance. However, rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on one area (sewage disposal). No significant differences were found between the ratings of rural and urban counties on water supply. Both counties were rated equally high with regard to water supply.

III. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF FAMILY LIVING

In this section, findings are presented under four community problem areas with regard to family living. The areas are: (1) children's day care, (2) condition of homes, (3) family income, and (4) family living conditions.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Children's Day Care

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair with regard to children's day care. In rural counties, 50.5 percent of the leaders rated children's day care as fair, whereas in urban counties 48.8 percent of the leaders rated the areas as fair. Approximately 26.0 percent and 40.0 percent of rural and urban county leaders rated children's day care as good.

When the comparison was made, the Chi-Square Test indicated that rural and urban counties were rated significantly different as to the ratings of children's day care. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties concerning children's day care.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Condition of Homes

Rural counties were rated fair on condition of homes. The area was rated fair by more than half (60.9 percent) of rural county leaders while 34.4 percent rated the area as good. However, urban counties were rated high on condition of homes. The majority (52.4 percent) of urban county leaders rated the area as good while 46.2 percent rated the area as fair.

Comparison by application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that rural and urban counties were rated significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on condition of homes.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Family Income

Rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to family income. The area was rated as fair in rural and urban counties by

approximately the same percentage of county leaders (67.0 percent). Less than 10 percent of rural county leaders and 24.3 percent of urban county leaders rated the area as good.

However, the Chi-Square Test indicated that rural and urban counties were rated significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to family income.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Family Living Conditions

Rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to family living conditions. More than half of rural county leaders (66.0 percent) and urban county leaders (54.9 percent) rated the area as fair while 30.2 percent and 43.3 percent rated the area as good.

However, the application of the Chi-Square Test showed that the ratings of family living conditions in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on family living conditions.

Summary Findings: Family Living

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties with regard to all four community problem areas included in family living. The four community problem areas were: children's day care, condition of homes, family income, and family living conditions.

IV. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF HEALTH AND EDUCATION

In this section, the findings are reported in seven areas of community problems with regard to health and education. The areas are: (1) availability of doctors and dentists, (2) availability of hospitals and clinics, (3) availability of public health services, (4) education, (5) nursing homes, (6) public libraries, and (7) school buildings.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Doctors and Dentists

Rural and urban counties were rated high with regard to availability of doctors and dentists. The area was rated as good in rural and urban counties by a majority of the county leaders (54.0 percent, rural; 74.1 percent, urban), whereas 35.6 percent and 20.8 percent of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as good.

Comparison by the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of availability of doctors and dentists in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on the availability of doctors and dentists.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Hospitals and Clinics

Rural and urban counties were rated high with regard to availability of hospitals and clinics. The area was rated as good by a majority of leaders in rural and urban counties; however, a higher

percentage of urban county leaders (70.9 percent) than rural county leaders (55.4 percent) rated the area as good.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to availability of hospitals and clinics were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on the availability of hospitals and clinics.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Public Health Services

Rural and urban counties tended to be rated high with regard to availability of public health services. The area was rated as good in rural and urban counties by approximately the same percentage of county leaders (49.0 percent). The percentage of rural and urban county leaders who rated the area as fair and poor were also approximately the same.

The application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that no significant differences existed between the ratings of rural and urban counties regarding the availability of public health services ($p = 0.985$). Rural and urban counties were rated equally high on the availability of public health services.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Education

Rural counties tended to be rated fair with regard to education. It was rated as fair by a majority (48.8 percent) of the county leaders while 41.5 percent rated it as fair, urban counties however were rated high on education. About half of the leaders in urban counties (52.2 percent) rated the area as good and 43.1 percent rated it as fair.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of education in rural versus urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to education.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Nursing Homes

Rural and urban counties were rated high on nursing homes. The area was rated as good in rural and urban counties by a majority of county leaders. About the same percentage of leaders in rural and urban counties rated nursing homes as being good, fair and poor.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of nursing homes in rural and urban counties were not significantly different. Rural and urban counties were rated equally high with regard to nursing homes.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Libraries

Public libraries in rural and urban counties were highly rated. The area was rated as good by a majority of rural and urban county leaders. However, the ratings showed that urban county leaders rated the area as good in larger proportion than rural county leaders with regard to public libraries (69.5 percent, urban; 57.4 percent, rural).

Comparison by the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that there were significant differences between the ratings of public libraries in rural and urban counties. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to public libraries.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to School Buildings

Rural and urban counties appeared to be highly rated for their school buildings. The majority of leaders in rural and urban counties rated school buildings as good. However, a higher percentage of leaders in urban counties rated the area as good (55.6 percent) than leaders in rural counties (45.6 percent). About 44.0 percent of rural county leaders and 40.0 percent of urban county leaders rated the area as fair.

Comparison by the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of school buildings in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to school buildings.

Summary Findings: Health and Education

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties in five out of seven areas included in health and education. The five areas were: (1) availability of doctors and dentists, (2) availability of hospitals and clinics, (3) education, (4) public libraries, and (5) school buildings. On the other hand, no significant differences were found between rural and urban counties in the areas of availability of public health services and nursing homes. With regard to these two areas, rural and urban counties were rated equally high by the county leaders.

V. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND GENERAL COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT

In this section, findings are presented under seven community problem areas with regard to recreational and general community

environment. The seven areas are: (1) citizen participation in local government, (2) community organizations, (3) conservation of natural resources, (4) general community appearance, (5) land use planning and zoning, (6) parks and playgrounds, and (7) recreational opportunity for all ages.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Citizen Participation in Local Government

In general, rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to citizen participation in local government. Approximately the same majority of rural and urban county leaders rated the area as fair (54.0 percent). However, the percentage of urban county leaders who rated the area as good (20.1 percent) was higher than the percentage of rural county leaders (13.9 percent).

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of citizen participation in local government in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties with regard to citizen participation in local government.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Community Organizations

Rural counties appeared to be rated fair in community organizations. The majority of leaders in rural counties rated the area as fair (49.3 percent) while 39.1 percent rated it as good. On the other hand, rural counties were rated high in community organizations. A majority of

leaders in urban counties rated the area as good (48.6 percent) while approximately 45.0 percent rated it as fair.

The application of the Chi-Square Test on the ratings of community organizations in rural and urban counties revealed the ratings were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on community organizations.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Conservation of Natural Resources

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on conservation of natural resources. More than half of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair (60.8 percent and 59.6 percent, respectively) while 22.9 percent and 26.1 percent rated the area as good.

When the ratings were compared by the Chi-Square Test, no significant differences were found between the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to conservation of natural resources.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to General Community Appearance

Rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to general community appearance. More than half of rural and urban county leaders rated the area as fair (59.4 percent, rural; 52.7 percent, urban), while 30.0 percent of rural and 41.2 percent of urban county leaders rated the area as good.

Comparison by the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of general community appearance in rural and urban

counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to general community appearance.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Land Use Planning and Zoning

Rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to land use planning and zoning. More than half of rural and urban county leaders rated the area as fair (55.5 percent and 58.2 percent, respectively). However a slightly higher percentage of urban county leaders than rural county leaders rated the area as good (19.0 percent, urban; 15.7 percent, rural).

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of land use planning and zoning in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were significantly rated higher than rural counties on land use planning and zoning.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Parks and Playgrounds

It appeared that rural counties were rated fairly high with regard to parks and playgrounds. The area was rated as good and as fair by approximately the same percentage of rural county leaders. However, a slightly higher percentage of leaders in urban counties than rural counties rated the area as good (39.2 percent, urban; 37.1 percent, rural).

Comparison by the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of parks and playgrounds in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to parks and playgrounds.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Recreational Opportunities for All Ages

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair on recreational opportunities for all ages. The area was rated as fair by the majority of leaders in rural and urban counties (40.7 percent and 47.0 percent, respectively), whereas 22.3 percent and 30.1 percent of rural and urban county leaders rated the area as good.

Comparison by the application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of recreational opportunities for all ages in rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on recreational opportunities for all ages.

Summary Findings: Recreational and General Community Environment

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties in six community problem areas included in recreational and general community environment. The six areas were: (1) citizen participation in local government, (2) community organizations, (3) general community appearance, (4) land use planning and zoning, (5) parks and playgrounds, and (6) recreational opportunities for all ages. However, rural and urban counties were not rated significantly different with regard to conservation of natural resources.

Table Summary: All Leaders' Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties Regarding 32 Community Problem Areas

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties with regard to 26 out of 32 community problem areas selected in this

study. Rural counties were rated significantly higher than urban counties on only one area (sewage disposal). However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to five areas (local agriculture, water supply, conservation of natural resources, availability of public health services, and nursing homes).

All 12 groups of leaders surveyed rated local agriculture, sources of credit, water supply, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, nursing homes, and public libraries in rural counties as high; whereas, jobs available and public transportation were rated low.

In urban counties, local agriculture, local stores, sources of credit, fire protection, public buildings, water supply, condition of homes, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, nursing homes, public libraries and school buildings were rated high by all leaders surveyed; whereas, public transportation was rated low.

CHAPTER V

COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY FIVE GROUPS OF EXTENSION-RELATED AUDIENCES

The purpose of this chapter is to fulfill the second objective of the study which was to compare rural and urban counties with regard to the ratings of 32 problem areas as perceived by five groups of leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences.

Extention-related audiences were classified into five classes: (1) County Rural Development Committee, (2) Home Demonstration Club Presidents, (3) Community Club Presidents, (4) Senior 4-H Club Presidents, and (5) County Agricultural Extension Committee.

The comparison of community problem areas in rural and urban counties as rated by Extension-related audiences were made by the Chi-Square Test. A 5 percent level of confidence is accepted as being significant.

This chapter is divided into the following five sections: (1) business, industry and employment, (2) community facilities and services, (3) family living, (4) health and education, and (5) recreational and general community environment. Data are summarized in Table II.

I. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT

Findings regarding six community problem areas with regard to business, industry and employment are summarized in this section: (1)

TABLE II

FIVE GROUPS OF EXTENSION-RELATED LEADERS' RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS

Leaders Audience / Problem Areas	Co. Rural Develop. Committee				Home Demo. Club President				Community Club President				Sr. 4-H Club President				County Ag. Ext Committee			
	Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Business, Industry and Employment																				
Jobs Available																				
Good	32	7.57	16	16.16	33	6.8	33	14.6	8	8.1	4	1.0	11	9.7	2	9.5	29	11.5	17	20.2
Fair	170	40.19	58	58.59	227	46.5	124	54.9	40	40.4	25	62.5	51	45.1	11	52.4	113	44.8	50	59.5
Poor	221	52.25	25	25.25	228	46.7	69	30.5	51	51.5	11	27.5	51	45.1	8	38.1	110	43.7	17	20.2
Total	423	100.00	99	100.00	488	100.0	226	100.0	99	100.0	40	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	252	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 25.07		p - 0.000		X^2 - 22.20		p - 0.000		X^2 - 6.78		p - 0.034		X^2 - 0.40		p - 0.818		X^2 - 15.44		p - 0.000	
Job Training and Retraining																				
Good	39	9.33	23	24.21	64	13.5	35	16.4	6	6.0	5	13.5	15	13.3	7	33.3	31	12.7	10	13.0
Fair	212	50.72	49	51.58	204	43.0	110	51.6	36	36.0	21	56.8	62	54.9	6	28.6	105	42.9	49	63.6
Poor	167	39.95	23	24.21	206	43.5	68	31.9	58	58.0	11	29.7	36	31.8	8	38.1	109	44.5	18	23.4
Total	418	100.00	95	100.00	474	100.0	213	100.0	100	100.0	37	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	245	100.0	77	100.0
	X^2 - 19.37		p - 0.000		X^2 - 8.16		p - 0.017		X^2 - 8.98		p - 0.011		X^2 - 6.96		p - 0.031		X^2 - 11.92		p - 0.003	
Local Agriculture																				
Good	221	52.62	52	53.6	284	58.6	142	64.6	53	52.5	20	51.3	77	68.1	10	47.6	138	54.6	50	59.5
Fair	189	45.0	42	43.3	190	39.2	72	32.7	43	42.6	18	46.2	34	30.1	10	47.6	107	42.3	32	38.1
Poor	10	2.38	3	3.1	11	2.3	6	2.7	5	4.9	1	2.5	2	1.8	1	4.8	8	3.1	2	2.4
Total	420	100.00	97	100.0	485	100.0	220	100.0	101	100.0	39	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	253	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 0.22		p - 0.894		X^2 - 2.72		p - 0.256		X^2 - 0.46		p - 0.793		X^2 - 3.51		p - 0.173		X^2 - 0.68		p - 0.712	
Local Industry																				
Good	130	30.7	48	49.0	141	29.0	95	42.2	22	21.6	15	39.5	41	35.7	8	38.1	73	29.0	39	45.9
Fair	181	42.8	41	41.8	235	48.4	100	44.4	50	49.0	21	55.3	53	46.1	9	42.9	117	46.4	37	43.5
Poor	112	26.5	9	9.2	110	22.6	30	13.3	30	29.4	2	5.2	21	18.2	4	19.0	62	24.6	9	10.1
Total	423	100.0	98	100.0	486	100.0	225	100.0	102	100.0	38	100.0	115	100.0	21	100.0	252	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 18.02		p - 0.000		X^2 - 15.34		p - 0.000		X^2 - 10.64		p - 0.005		X^2 - 0.076		p - 0.963		X^2 - 11.51		p - 0.003	
Local Stores																				
Good	127	30.2	55	55.6	173	35.2	127	56.0	32	31.1	28	71.8	47	40.9	12	57.1	94	37.3	51	61.5
Fair	214	50.8	37	37.4	241	49.0	80	25.2	58	56.3	8	20.5	54	47.0	7	33.3	130	51.6	29	34.9
Poor	80	19.0	7	7.1	78	15.8	20	8.8	13	12.6	3	7.7	14	12.1	2	9.5	28	11.1	3	3.6
Total	421	100.0	99	100.0	492	100.0	227	100.0	103	100.0	39	100.0	115	100.0	21	100.0	252	100.0	83	100.0
	X^2 - 24.59		p - 0.000		X^2 - 28.31		p - 0.000		X^2 - 19.51		p - 0.000		X^2 - 1.93		p - 0.382		X^2 15.85		p - 0.000	

TABLE II (Continued)

Leaders Audience / Problem Areas	Co. Rural Develop. Committee				Home Demo. Club President				Community Club President				Sr. 4-H Club President				County Ag. Ext Committee			
	Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sources of Credit																				
Good	227	54.4	65	66.3	272	58.1	133	61.0	53	52.0	21	53.9	54	48.7	9	42.9	140	56.5	52	64.2
Fair	170	40.8	32	32.7	180	38.5	78	35.8	42	41.2	16	41.0	49	44.1	10	47.6	98	39.5	26	32.1
Poor	20	4.8	1	1.0	16	3.4	7	3.2	7	6.9	2	5.1	8	7.2	2	9.5	10	4.0	3	3.7
Total	417	100.0	98	100.0	468	100.0	218	100.0	102	100.0	39	100.0	111	100.0	21	100.0	248	100.0	81	100.0
	X^2 - 6.09		p - 0.048		X^2 - 0.51		p - 0.773		X^2 - 0.15		p - 0.927		X^2 - 0.30		p - 0.862		X^2 - 1.54		p - 0.464	
Community Facilities and Services																				
Fire Protection																				
Good	150	38.3	39	39.4	208	42.3	106	46.9	34	33.7	16	41.0	46	40.4	10	47.6	84	34.2	45	52.9
Fair	185	44.3	52	52.5	206	41.9	92	40.7	50	49.5	16	41.0	55	48.3	10	47.6	115	46.8	35	41.2
Poor	73	17.5	8	8.1	78	15.8	28	12.4	17	16.8	7	18.0	13	11.4	1	4.8	47	19.1	5	5.9
Total	418	100.0	99	100.0	492	100.0	226	100.0	101	100.0	39	100.0	114	100.0	21	100.0	246	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 5.72		p - 0.057		X^2 - 2.07		p - 0.356		X^2 - 0.88		p - 0.645		X^2 - 0.98		p - 0.612		X^2 - 13.19		p - 0.001	
Garbage and Trash Disposal																				
Good	136	32.3	30	30.3	175	36.1	98	43.4	35	35.4	16	42.1	30	26.3	8	38.1	80	32.1	32	38.1
Fair	180	43.0	50	50.5	220	45.4	93	41.2	47	47.5	15	39.5	62	54.4	8	38.1	114	45.8	46	54.8
Poor	103	24.6	19	19.2	90	18.6	35	15.5	17	17.2	7	18.4	22	19.3	5	23.8	55	22.1	6	7.1
Total	419	100.0	99	100.0	485	100.0	226	100.0	99	100.0	38	100.0	114	100.0	21	100.0	249	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 2.13		p - 0.345		X^2 - 3.58		p - 0.167		X^2 - 0.75		p - 0.688		X^2 - 1.96		p - 0.375		X^2 - 9.38		p - 0.009	
Police Protection																				
Good	148	35.6	30	30.3	164	33.7	79	35.0	24	23.8	12	30.8	36	32.1	8	38.1	74	29.6	33	38.8
Fair	220	52.9	59	59.6	252	51.8	120	53.1	57	56.4	22	56.4	63	56.3	11	52.4	147	58.8	55	51.8
Poor	48	11.5	10	10.0	71	14.6	27	11.9	20	19.8	5	12.8	13	11.6	2	9.5	29	11.6	8	9.4
Total	416	100.0	99	100.0	487	100.0	226	100.0	101	100.0	39	100.0	112	100.0	21	100.0	250	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 1.46		p - 0.483		X^2 - 0.906		p - 0.636		X^2 - 1.31		p - 0.521		X^2 - 0.311		p - 0.859		X^2 - 2.52		p - 0.284	
Public Buildings																				
Good	150	35.6	49	49.5	170	34.7	108	47.8	47	47.0	25	62.5	47	40.9	9	42.9	97	38.5	47	55.3
Fair	225	53.4	46	46.5	282	57.6	105	46.5	49	49.0	12	30.0	64	55.7	8	38.1	128	50.8	35	41.2
Poor	46	11.0	4	4.0	38	7.7	13	5.7	4	4.0	3	7.5	4	3.5	4	19.0	27	10.7	3	3.5
Total	421	100.0	99	100.0	490	100.0	226	100.0	100	100.0	40	100.0	115	100.0	21	100.0	252	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 8.73		p - 0.013		X^2 - 11.22		p - 0.004		X^2 - 4.40		p - 0.111		X^2 - 8.37		p - 0.015		X^2 - 9.10		p - 0.011	
Public Transportation																				
Good	24	5.9	6	6.5	34	7.1	19	8.8	7	7.4	6	16.7	16	14.4	2	10.0	18	7.6	15	18.3
Fair	105	25.7	35	37.6	135	28.3	70	32.6	18	19.0	11	30.6	32	28.8	9	45.0	68	28.8	35	42.7
Poor	280	68.4	52	55.9	308	64.6	126	58.6	70	73.7	19	52.8	63	56.8	9	45.0	150	63.6	32	39.0
Total	409	100.0	93	100.0	477	100.0	215	100.0	95	100.0	36	100.0	111	100.0	20	100.0	236	100.0	82	100.0
	X^2 - 5.73		p - 0.057		X^2 - 2.31		p - 0.315		X^2 - 5.54		p - 0.063		X^2 - 2.08		p - 0.353		X^2 - 16.69		p - 0.000	

TABLE II (Continued)

Leaders Audience / Problem Areas	Co. Rural Develop. Committee				Home Demo. Club President				Community Club President				Sr. 4-H Club President				County Ag. Ext Committee			
	Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Road Maintenance																				
Good	78	18.6	25	25.3	70	14.3	28	12.3	28	27.7	10	25.6	11	9.6	2	10.0	44	17.5	22	25.9
Fair	208	49.5	52	52.5	227	46.3	130	57.3	38	37.6	15	38.5	66	57.9	13	65.0	122	48.4	50	58.8
Poor	134	31.9	22	22.2	193	39.4	69	30.4	35	34.7	14	35.9	37	32.5	5	25.0	86	34.1	13	15.3
Total	420	100.0	99	100.0	490	100.0	227	100.0	101	100.0	39	100.0	114	100.0	20	100.0	252	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 4.45		p - 0.108		X^2 - 7.60		p - 0.022		X^2 - 0.063		p - 0.969		X^2 - 0.45		p - 0.799		X^2 - 11.33		p - 0.003	
Sewage Disposal																				
Good	117	28.2	19	19.4	147	32.2	77	36.3	28	29.5	8	21.6	47	42.0	4	19.1	77	32.6	24	28.6
Fair	196	47.2	49	50.0	229	50.2	83	39.2	40	42.1	16	43.2	45	40.2	8	38.1	108	45.8	42	50.0
Poor	102	24.6	30	30.6	80	17.5	52	24.5	27	28.4	13	35.1	20	17.9	9	42.9	51	21.6	18	21.4
Total	415	100.0	98	100.0	456	100.0	212	100.0	95	100.0	37	100.0	112	100.0	21	100.0	236	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 3.57		p - 0.168		X^2 - 8.09		p - 0.018		X^2 - 1.01		p - 0.605		X^2 - 7.51		p - 0.023		X^2 - 0.56		p - 0.755	
Water Supply																				
Good	238	56.5	53	53.5	314	65.3	147	64.2	71	69.6	28	71.8	83	73.5	9	42.9	160	63.8	51	60.0
Fair	144	34.2	39	39.4	136	28.3	65	38.4	19	18.6	7	18.0	24	21.2	10	47.6	69	27.5	28	32.9
Poor	39	9.3	7	7.1	31	6.4	17	7.4	12	11.8	4	10.3	6	5.3	2	9.5	22	8.7	6	7.1
Total	421	100.0	99	100.0	481	100.0	229	100.0	102	100.0	39	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	251	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 1.18		p - 0.555		X^2 - 0.25		p - 0.883		X^2 - 0.083		p - 0.959		X^2 - 7.80		p - 0.020		X^2 - 1.02		p - 0.601	
Family Living																				
Children's Day Care																				
Good	78	19.2	37	38.1	153	33.3	99	45.4	25	25.8	10	27.8	39	35.8	5	23.8	60	24.9	32	40.0
Fair	233	57.4	51	52.6	222	48.3	95	43.6	45	46.4	17	47.2	46	42.2	11	52.4	123	51.0	39	48.8
Poor	95	23.4	9	9.3	85	18.5	24	11.0	27	27.8	9	25.0	24	22.0	5	23.8	58	24.1	9	11.2
Total	406	100.0	97	100.0	460	100.0	218	100.0	97	100.0	36	100.0	109	100.0	21	100.0	241	100.0	80	100.0
	X^2 - 20.15		p - 0.000		X^2 - 11.70		p - 0.003		X^2 - 0.122		p - 0.941		X^2 - 1.19		p - 0.552		X^2 - 9.57		p - 0.008	
Condition of Homes																				
Good	130	31.1	40	40.8	177	36.2	118	52.9	29	28.4	26	65.0	38	33.6	8	40.0	101	40.4	43	51.8
Fair	269	64.4	56	57.1	304	62.2	101	45.3	65	63.7	12	30.0	71	62.8	11	55.0	145	58.0	40	48.2
Poor	19	4.6	2	2.1	8	1.6	4	1.8	8	7.8	2	5.0	4	3.5	1	5.0	4	1.6	0	0.0
Total	418	100.0	98	100.0	489	100.0	223	100.0	102	100.0	40	100.0	113	100.0	20	100.0	250	100.0	83	100.0
	X^2 - 4.154		p - 0.125		X^2 - 18.02		p - 0.000		X^2 - 16.28		p - 0.000		X^2 - 0.47		p - 0.793		X^2 - 4.28		p - 0.118	

TABLE II (Continued)

Leaders Audience / Problem Areas	Co. Rural Develop. Committee				Home Demo. Club President				Community Club President				Sr. 4-H Club President				County Ag. Ext Committee			
	Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Family Income																				
Good	31	7.5	21	21.2	44	9.2	51	23.1	9	8.8	9	23.1	19	16.8	5	23.8	18	7.2	24	28.2
Fair	276	66.5	69	69.7	354	73.6	149	67.4	70	68.6	27	69.2	76	67.3	12	57.1	180	72.3	60	70.6
Poor	108	26.0	9	9.1	83	17.2	21	9.5	23	22.6	3	7.7	18	15.9	4	19.1	51	20.5	1	1.2
Total	415	100.0	99	100.0	481	100.0	221	100.0	102	100.0	39	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	249	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 25.11		p - 0.000		X^2 - 28.66		p - 0.000		X^2 - 7.87		p - 0.020		X^2 - 0.87		p - 0.649		X^2 - 37.43		p - 0.000	
Family Living Conditions																				
Good	114	27.5	33	33.3	140	29.2	92	41.3	27	26.2	17	46.0	43	38.1	6	30.0	80	31.8	35	41.7
Fair	280	67.5	64	64.7	319	66.5	124	55.6	73	70.9	18	48.7	67	59.3	13	65.0	169	67.1	49	58.3
Poor	21	5.1	2	2.0	21	5.4	7	3.1	3	2.9	2	5.4	3	2.6	1	5.0	3	1.2	0	0.0
Total	415	100.0	99	100.0	480	100.0	223	100.0	103	100.0	37	100.0	113	100.0	20	100.0	252	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 2.71		p - 0.258		X^2 - 10.17		p - 0.006		X^2 - 5.92		p - 0.052		X^2 - 0.70		p - 0.704		X^2 - 3.55		p - 0.169	
Health and Education																				
Availability of Doctors and Dentists																				
Good	230	54.4	67	68.4	274	55.2	108	73.0	54	52.9	36	90.0	69	61.1	12	57.1	141	56.2	68	81.0
Fair	159	37.6	26	26.5	167	33.7	47	20.4	33	32.4	3	7.5	38	33.6	7	33.3	94	37.5	13	15.5
Poor	34	8.0	5	5.1	55	11.1	15	6.5	15	14.7	1	2.5	6	5.3	2	9.5	16	6.4	3	3.5
Total	423	100.0	98	100.0	496	100.0	230	100.0	102	100.0	40	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	251	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 6.39		p - 0.041		X^2 - 20.92		p - 0.000		X^2 - 17.02		p - 0.000		X^2 - 0.57		p - 0.751		X^2 - 16.58		p - 0.000	
Availability of Hospitals and Clinics																				
Good	233	55.1	63	65.0	291	58.7	159	69.7	63	62.4	35	89.7	66	58.4	14	66.7	137	54.6	64	75.3
Fair	136	32.1	23	23.7	149	30.0	53	23.3	26	25.7	4	10.3	39	34.5	3	14.3	88	35.1	14	16.5
Poor	54	12.8	11	11.3	56	11.3	16	7.0	12	11.9	0	0.0	8	7.1	4	19.0	26	10.3	7	8.2
Total	423	100.0	97	100.0	496	100.0	228	100.0	101	100.0	39	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	251	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 3.32		p - 0.191		X^2 8.53		p - 0.014		X^2 - 10.79		p - 0.005		X^2 - 5.35		p - 0.009		X^2 - 12.07		p - 0.002	
Availability of Public Health Services																				
Good	204	48.8	42	43.3	261	53.6	114	51.1	41	42.3	16	44.4	59	52.2	3	14.3	116	46.8	56	67.5
Fair	199	47.6	51	52.6	206	42.3	96	43.1	45	46.4	20	55.6	48	42.5	16	76.2	122	49.2	24	28.9
Poor	15	3.6	4	4.1	20	4.1	13	5.8	11	11.3	0	0.0	6	5.3	2	9.5	10	4.0	3	3.6
Total	418	100.0	97	100.0	487	100.0	223	100.0	97	100.0	36	100.0	113	100.0	21	100.0	248	100.0	83	100.0
	X^2 - 0.96		p - 0.618		X^2 - 1.17		p - 0.556		X^2 - 4.56		p - 0.102		X^2 - 10.25		p - 0.006		X^2 - 10.95		p - 0.004	
Education																				
Good	150	35.7	57	58.2	199	40.4	97	42.7	45	44.1	18	46.2	61	53.0	12	57.1	107	42.3	56	65.9
Fair	221	52.6	39	39.8	264	53.6	116	51.1	44	43.1	20	51.3	48	41.7	5	28.8	129	51.0	26	30.6
Poor	49	11.7	2	2.0	30	6.1	14	6.2	13	12.8	1	2.5	6	5.2	4	19.1	17	6.7	3	3.5
Total	420	100.0	98	100.0	493	100.0	227	100.0	102	100.0	39	100.0	115	100.0	21	100.0	253	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 20.10		p - 0.000		X^2 - 0.39		p - 0.823		X^2 - 3.38		p - 0.184		X^2 - 6.14		p - 0.046		X^2 - 14.21		p - 0.001	

TABLE II (Continued)

Leaders Audience / Problem Areas	Co. Rural Develop. Committee				Home Demo. Club President				Community Club President				Sr. 4-H Club President				County Ag. Ext Committee			
	Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Nursing Homes																				
Good	244	58.5	51	52.0	242	50.2	102	46.0	54	53.4	19	52.8	66	58.9	7	33.3	147	59.8	49	59.8
Fair	154	36.9	42	42.9	212	44.0	101	45.5	41	40.6	14	38.9	36	32.1	10	47.6	85	34.6	28	34.2
Poor	19	4.6	5	5.1	28	5.8	19	8.5	6	5.9	3	8.3	10	9.0	4	19.1	14	5.7	5	6.1
Total	417	100.0	98	100.0	482	100.0	222	100.0	101	100.0	36	100.0	112	100.0	21	100.0	246	100.0	82	100.0
	X^2 - 1.36		p - 0.506		X^2 - 2.36		p - 0.307		X^2 - 0.25		p - 0.881		X^2 - 5.06		p - 0.080		X^2 - 0.02		p - 0.990	
Public Libraries																				
Good	223	52.8	68	68.7	338	68.3	174	77.3	68	66.7	31	77.5	72	62.6	14	66.7	153	61.2	60	70.6
Fair	173	41.0	27	27.3	133	26.9	41	18.2	29	28.4	6	15.0	34	29.6	6	28.6	78	31.2	22	25.9
Poor	26	6.2	4	4.0	24	4.8	10	4.5	5	4.9	3	7.5	9	7.8	1	4.7	19	7.6	3	3.5
Total	422	100.0	99	100.0	495	100.0	225	100.0	102	100.0	40	100.0	115	100.0	21	100.0	250	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 8.16		p - 0.017		X^2 - 6.62		p - 0.037		X^2 - 2.93		p - 0.231		X^2 - 0.28		p - 0.870		X^2 - 3.08		p - 0.214	
School Buildings																				
Good	201	48.0	53	53.5	213	43.4	100	44.6	49	47.6	26	68.4	60	52.6	7	33.3	134	53.6	54	65.1
Fair	169	40.3	44	44.4	233	47.5	111	49.6	45	43.7	12	31.6	45	89.5	11	52.4	95	38.0	29	34.9
Poor	49	11.7	2	2.0	45	9.1	13	5.8	9	8.7	0	0.0	9	7.9	3	14.3	21	8.4	0	0.0
Total	419	100.0	99	100.0	491	100.0	224	100.0	103	100.0	38	100.0	114	100.0	21	100.0	250	100.0	83	100.0
	X^2 - 8.45		p - 0.015		X^2 - 2.34		p - 0.310		X^2 6.60		p - 0.037		X^2 - 2.86		p - 0.240		X^2 - 8.58		p - 0.014	
Recreational and General Community Environment																				
Citizen Participation in Local Government																				
Good	57	13.7	20	20.4	74	15.1	47	21.1	12	11.7	4	10.8	22	19.3	3	14.3	32	12.8	16	19.1
Fair	217	52.0	48	49.0	277	56.4	130	58.3	46	44.7	24	64.9	75	65.8	12	57.1	144	57.4	50	59.5
Poor	143	34.3	30	30.6	140	28.5	46	20.6	45	43.7	9	24.3	17	14.9	6	28.6	75	29.9	18	21.4
Total	417	100.0	98	100.0	491	100.0	223	100.0	103	100.0	37	100.0	114	100.0	21	100.0	251	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 2.88		p - 0.238		X^2 7.02		p - 0.030		X^2 - 4.87		p - 0.087		X^2 - 2.39		p - 0.303		X^2 - 3.41		p - 0.182	
Community Organizations																				
Good	148	35.3	49	50.0	222	45.6	118	52.2	27	26.7	15	37.5	46	40.4	10	47.6	95	37.9	35	42.2
Fair	221	52.7	42	42.9	209	42.9	93	41.2	52	51.5	19	47.5	57	50.0	9	42.9	124	49.4	45	54.2
Poor	50	12.0	7	7.1	56	11.5	15	6.6	22	21.8	6	15.0	11	9.6	2	5.5	32	12.8	3	3.6
Total	419	100.0	98	100.0	487	100.0	226	100.0	101	100.0	40	100.0	114	100.0	21	100.0	251	100.0	83	100.0
	X^2 - 7.67		p - 0.022		X^2 - 5.20		p - 0.074		X^2 - 1.87		p - 0.393		X^2 - 0.411		p - 0.814		X^2 - 5.55		p - 0.062	

TABLE II (Continued)

Leaders Audience / Problem Areas	Co. Rural Develop. Committee				Home Demo. Club President				Community Club President				Sr. 4-H Club President				County Ag. Ext Committee			
	Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties		Rural Counties		Urban Counties	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Conservation of Natural Resources																				
Good	96	23.0	17	17.4	89	18.7	55	25.4	15	15.2	11	28.2	37	32.5	6	28.6	62	25.0	22	26.8
Fair	254	60.9	68	69.4	300	63.2	130	59.9	62	62.6	20	57.3	64	56.1	12	57.1	151	60.9	51	62.2
Poor	67	16.1	13	13.3	86	18.1	32	14.7	22	22.2	8	20.5	13	11.4	3	14.3	35	14.1	9	11.0
Total	417	100.0	98	100.0	475	100.0	217	100.0	99	100.0	39	100.0	114	100.0	21	100.0	248	100.0	82	100.0
	X^2 - 2.48		p - 0.290		X^2 4.37		p - 0.113		X^2 - 3.17		p - 0.205		X^2 - 0.211		p - 0.400		X^2 - 0.55		p - 0.758	
General Community Appearance																				
Good	113	26.8	37	37.4	161	32.8	83	37.1	21	20.8	18	50.0	42	36.8	4	20.0	77	30.6	34	40.0
Fair	251	59.6	60	60.6	291	59.3	127	56.7	66	65.4	18	50.0	65	57.0	15	75.0	151	59.9	49	57.7
Poor	57	13.5	2	2.0	39	7.9	14	6.2	14	13.7	0	0.0	7	6.1	1	5.0	24	9.5	2	2.3
Total	421	100.0	99	100.0	491	100.0	224	100.0	101	100.0	36	100.0	114	100.0	20	100.0	252	100.0	85	100.0
	X^2 - 12.47		p - 0.002		X^2 - 1.59		p - 0.452		X^2 - 13.96		p - 0.001		X^2 - 2.37		p - 0.307		X^2 - 6.01		p - 0.049	
Land Use Planning and Zoning																				
Good	49	12.0	15	15.6	69	15.7	36	17.1	16	16.2	5	12.8	21	19.1	0	0.0	46	19.3	17	20.7
Fair	206	50.2	52	54.2	258	58.6	129	61.4	57	57.6	26	66.7	70	63.6	16	80.0	127	53.4	45	54.9
Poor	155	37.8	29	30.2	113	25.7	45	21.4	26	26.2	8	20.5	19	17.3	4	20.0	65	27.3	20	24.4
Total	410	100.0	96	100.0	440	100.0	210	100.0	99	100.0	39	100.0	110	100.0	20	100.0	238	100.0	82	100.0
	X^2 - 2.30		p - 0.317		X^2 - 1.432		p - 0.489		X^2 - 0.97		p - 0.617		X^2 - 4.57		p - 0.102		X^2 - 0,28		p - 0.868	
Parks and Playgrounds																				
Good	146	34.8	37	37.4	185	37.7	94	41.6	29	29.0	16	40.0	55	47.8	7	33.3	98	39.4	34	40.5
Fair	153	36.5	49	49.5	191	38.9	92	40.7	34	34.0	20	50.0	30	26.1	8	38.1	85	34.1	39	46.4
Poor	120	28.6	13	13.1	115	23.4	40	17.7	37	37.0	4	10.00	30	26.1	6	28.6	66	26.5	11	13.1
Total	419	100.0	99	100.0	491	100.0	220	100.0	100	100.0	40	100.0	115	100.0	21	100.0	249	100.0	84	100.0
	X^2 - 11.11		p - 0.004		X^2 - 3.08		p - 0.214		X^2 -10.08		p - 0.006		X^2 - 1.78		p - 0.411		X^2 - 7.45		p - 0.024	
Recreational Opportunities for all Ages																				
Good	73	17.3	22	22.2	99	20.2	69	30.5	18	17.8	10	25.6	32	27.8	4	20.0	58	23.1	25	30.1
Fair	180	42.6	59	59.6	215	43.8	106	46.9	33	32.7	21	53.9	42	36.5	7	35.0	98	39.0	45	54.2
Poor	170	40.2	18	18.2	177	36.0	51	22.6	50	49.5	8	20.5	41	35,7	9	45.0	95	37.9	13	15.7
Total	423	100.0	99	100.0	491	100.0	226	100.0	101	100.0	39	100.0	115	100.0	20	100.0	251	100.0	83	100.0
	X^2 - 16.96		p - 0.000		X^2 - 16.28		p - 0.000		X^2 - 9.84		p - 0.007		X^2 - 0.80		p - 0.669		X^2 - 14.08		p - 0.001	

jobs available, (2) job training and retraining, (3) local agriculture, (4) local industry, (5) local stores, and (6) sources of credit.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Jobs Available

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated between fair and poor by Extension-related county leaders as to jobs available. The majority of rural and urban county leaders in each five audiences rated jobs available as fair and poor, while less than 25.0 percent rated the area as good.

The application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of jobs available in rural and urban counties by four county leader groups (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee) were significantly different. Each of these county leader groups rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to jobs available. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by county leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Job Training and Retraining

In general, rural and urban counties were rated between fair and poor on job training and retraining. A large proportion of Extension-related rural and urban county leaders rated the area as fair and poor. With the exception of urban county leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club President, less than 25.0 percent of all rural and urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as good.

The application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of job training and retraining in rural and urban counties were significantly different in all five audiences. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on job training and retraining by Extension-related county leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Agriculture

Rural and urban counties were rated high on local agriculture. More than 50.0 percent of rural and urban county leaders in all five Extension-related audiences rated local agriculture as good. Less than 5 percent of the county leaders rated the area as poor.

An application of the Chi-Square Test to these data indicated that no significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to local agriculture as rated by county leaders belonging to all five Extension-related audiences.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Industry

Rural and urban counties were rated fairly high as to local industry. A majority of rural and urban county leaders belonging to each of the audiences rated the area as either good or fair. Less than 30.0 percent of rural and urban county leaders rated the area as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to local industry within four of the leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee). As rated by the four audiences, urban counties

were rated higher than rural counties with regard to local industry. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to local industry within Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Stores

Rural counties in general were rated fair with regard to local stores. A majority of rural county leaders belonging to all five audiences rated the area as fair. However, urban counties were rated high as to local stores. More than half of the urban county leaders belonging to all five audiences rated the area as good, while less than 10.0 percent rated it as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties within four of the audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee) on local stores. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to local stores. On the other hand, the ratings of rural and urban counties on local stores as rated by county leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents were not significantly different.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Sources of Credit

Rural and urban counties were rated high on sources of credit. The largest percentage of both rural and urban county leaders belonging to all audiences rated the area as good.

The application of the Chi-Square Test showed that the ratings of rural and urban counties on sources of credit within four of the audiences were not significantly different (Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, Senior 4-H Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee). In contrast, the ratings of rural and urban counties on sources of credit within one audience were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on sources of credit as rated by County Rural Development Committee.

Summary Findings: Business, Industry and Employment

With regard to four out of six areas included in business, industry and employment (jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, and local stores), urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties. The ratings of these four areas were found to be significantly different in rural and urban counties within three or more groups of Extension-related county leaders. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to local agriculture and sources of credit (no significant differences were found in more than three groups of Extension-related audiences).

II. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Eight community problem areas regarding community facilities and services are included in this section. The areas are: (1) fire

protection, (2) garbage and trash disposal, (3) police protection, (4) public buildings, (5) public transportation, (6) road maintenance, (7) sewage disposal, and (8) water supply.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Fire Protection

Rural and urban counties in general were rated fairly high on fire protection. A majority of rural and urban county leaders belonging to all five Extension-related audiences rated the area either as good or fair. Less than 20.0 percent of the county leaders rated the area as good.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, no significant differences were found in rural and urban counties within four of the Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and Senior 4-H Club Presidents) with regard to fire protection. However, in one Extension-related audience (County Agricultural Extension Committee), urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties on fire protection.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Garbage and Trash Disposal

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair on garbage and trash disposal as rated by county leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences. In general, the highest percentage of rural and urban county leaders within each audience rated the area as fair, while less than 25.0 percent rated it as good.

The application of the Chi-Square Test showed that no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on garbage and trash disposal as rated by four of Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and Senior 4-H Club Presidents). However, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on garbage and trash disposal as rated by County Agricultural Extension Committee members. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties as to garbage and trash disposal.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Police Protection

Rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to police protection. More than 50.0 percent of each audience rated police protection in rural and urban counties as fair.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, no significant differences were found ($P>0.05$) in the ratings of rural and urban counties on police protection within all five Extension-related audiences.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Buildings

In general, rural counties were rated fair, while urban counties were rated between high and fair with regard to public buildings. Approximately more than half of the rural county leaders in all audiences rated the area as fair; whereas, the majority of urban county leaders in all audiences rated the area as good and fair. Less than 20.0 percent of each audience rated the area as good.

The application of the Chi-Square Test showed that the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to public buildings as rated

by four Extension-related audiences were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on public buildings. On the other hand, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to public buildings as rated by Community Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Transportation

Rural and urban counties were rated low on public transportation. In almost all audiences, more than 50.0 percent of the county leaders rated the area as poor while less than 20.0 percent rated it as good.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties as rated by four Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and Senior 4-H Club Presidents). However, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by County Agricultural Extension Committee members with regard to public transportation. Within this audience, urban counties were rated higher than rural counties as to public transportation.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Road Maintenance

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair by Extension-related audiences with regard to road maintenance. A majority of county leaders in almost all audiences rated the area as fair.

The Chi-Square Test indicated that no significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties as rated by these Extension-related audiences: County Rural Development Committee,

Community Club Presidents and Senior 4-H Club Presidents with regard to road maintenance. However, significant differences existed in the ratings of two audiences. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties as rated by Home Demonstration Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee with regard to road maintenance.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Sewage Disposal

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair as to sewage disposal. The majority of all groups of leaders within the Extension-related audiences rated the area as fair.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties as rated by three Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee) with regard to sewage disposal. However, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties as rated by two Extension-related audiences (Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Senior 4-H Club Presidents) with regard to sewage disposal. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on sewage disposal.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Water Supply

In almost all Extension-related audiences, rural and urban counties were rated high on water supply. The area was rated as good by the largest percentage of county leaders while less than 10.0 percent rated it as poor (except 11.8 percent of rural Community Club Presidents rated it as poor).

The Chi-Square Test revealed that the ratings of rural and urban counties were not significantly different within four Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee) on water supply. Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by Senior 4-H Club Presidents. This audience rated rural counties higher than urban counties as to water supply.

Summary Findings: Community Facilities and Services

Urban counties were only rated significantly higher (in three or more Extension-related audiences) than rural counties with regard to public buildings. However, on the other seven areas included in community facilities and services (fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, police protection, public transportation, road maintenance, sewage disposal, and water supply), rural and urban counties were not rated significantly different within three or more Extension-related audiences.

III. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF FAMILY LIVING

The findings of four community problem areas with regard to family living are reported in this section. The areas are: (1) children's day care, (2) condition of homes, (3) family income, and (4) family living conditions.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Children's Day Care

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair on children's day care. The majority of rural and urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as fair with the exception of urban Home Demonstration Club Presidents who rated the area as good and fair with approximately the same percentage.

However, when the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, the ratings of rural and urban counties were significantly different in three of the Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee) with regard to children's day care. Within these three audiences, urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on children's day care.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Condition of Homes

Rural counties were rated fair on the condition of homes, while urban counties were rated moderately high. More than 50.0 percent of rural county leaders in all five audiences rated the area as fair. The majority of urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as either good or fair. Less than 10.0 percent of county leaders in all five audiences rated the area as poor.

An application of the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings or rural and urban counties were not significantly different in three audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Senior 4-H Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee) with regard to condition

of homes. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties within two audiences as to condition of homes. Urban counties were rated higher on condition of homes as rated by Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Community Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Family Income

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on family income as rated by Extension-related audiences. The largest percentage of county leaders in each audience rated the area as fair, while less than 30.0 percent rated it as good.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties within four of the audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee) with regard to family income. Within these four audiences, urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on family income. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on family income as rated by Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Family Living Conditions

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on family living conditions. The majority of rural and urban county leaders in each Extension-related audiences rated the area as fair while less than 10.0 percent rated it as poor.

The Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of rural and urban counties were not significantly different as to family living conditions by four audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents, Senior 4-H Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee). However, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to family living conditions by Home Demonstration Club Presidents. In this audience, urban counties were rated higher than rural counties as to family living conditions.

Summary Findings: Family Living

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties (significantly higher in three or more audiences) on two of the four areas included in family living by county leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on condition of homes and family living conditions by Extension-related audiences.

IV. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF HEALTH AND EDUCATION

The ratings of seven community problem areas regarding health and education are summarized in this section. The areas are: (1) availability of doctors and dentists, (2) availability of hospitals and clinics, (3) availability of public health services, (4) education, (5) nursing homes, (6) public libraries, and (7) school buildings.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Doctors and Dentists

Rural and urban counties were rated high on availability of doctors and dentists. A large proportion of rural and urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as good while less than 15.0 percent rated it as poor. However, the percentage of urban county leaders who rated the area as good was higher than the percentage of rural county leaders in four of the five audiences.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties within four audiences as to availability of doctors and dentists. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on availability of doctors and dentists as rated by County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee. On the other hand, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on availability of doctors and dentists as rated by Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Hospitals and Clinics

Both rural and urban counties were rated high on availability of hospitals and clinics. However, more than 65.0 percent of urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as good while the percentage of rural county leaders who rated the area as good was slightly lower. Less than 15.0 percent of each audience rated the area as poor.

An application of the Chi-Square Test showed that the ratings of rural and urban counties were significantly different in three of the five audiences. The ratings of urban counties were higher than rural counties with regard to availability of hospitals and clinics as rated by Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on availability of hospitals and clinics as rated by County Rural Development Committee and Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Public Health Services

Rural and urban counties were rated moderately high on availability of public health services. A majority of rural and urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as either good or fair. Less than 10.0 percent of county leaders in each audience rated the area as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban county on availability of public health services as rated by three audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Community Club Presidents). However, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties within two audiences. Rural counties were rated higher than urban counties as rated by Senior 4-H Club Presidents; whereas, urban counties were rated higher than rural

counties as rated by County Agricultural Extension Committee with regard to availability of public health service.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Education

In general, rural and urban counties were rated moderately high on education. The largest percentage of rural and urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as either good or fair. Less than 20.0 percent of the same audience rated the area as low.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of four audiences with regard to education. County leaders belonging to County Rural Development Committee, Senior 4-H Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee rated urban counties higher than rural counties with regard to Education. No significant differences were found, however, in the ratings of rural and urban counties on education as rated by Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Community Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Nursing Homes

Rural and urban counties were rated high on nursing homes. Almost all county leaders in each audience rated the area as good, while less than 20.0 percent rated the area as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data within all five audiences, the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to nursing homes were not significantly different.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Libraries

Rural and urban counties were rated high on public libraries. A high proportion of rural and urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as good, while less than 10.0 percent rated it as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on public libraries as rated by three audiences (Community Club Presidents, Senior 4-H Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee). However, the ratings of two audiences were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on public libraries as rated by County Rural Development Committee and Home Demonstration Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to School Buildings

In general, rural and urban counties were rated moderately high with regard to school buildings. The majority of rural and urban county leaders in each audience rated the area as either good or fair while less than 15.0 percent rated it as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties' school buildings. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on school buildings as rated by County Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties' school buildings as rated by Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Summary findings: Health and Education

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties on four of the seven problem areas included in health and education as rated by Extension-related audiences. On the four areas (availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, and school buildings), the ratings of urban county leaders were significantly higher than rural county leaders in three or more audiences. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to availability of public health services, nursing homes and public libraries. The ratings of rural and urban county leaders were not significantly different on the three areas as rated by three or more audiences.

V. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND GENERAL COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT

Findings regarding seven community problem areas are summarized in this section: (1) citizen participation in local government, (2) community organization, (3) conservation of natural resources, (4) general community environment, (5) land use planning and zoning, (6) parks and playgrounds, and (7) recreational opportunities for all ages.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Citizen Participation in Local Government

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on citizen participation in local government. A majority of county leaders in each audience rated the area as fair while less than 25.0 percent rated it as good.

The application of the Chi-Square Test revealed no significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on citizen participation in local government by four of the five Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents, Senior 4-H Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee). Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to citizen participation in local government by Home Demonstration Club Presidents. This audience rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to citizen participation in local government.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Community Organizations

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated moderately high. The highest proportion of county leaders in each audience rated the area as good or fair in either rural or urban counties, while 15.0 percent or less rated the area as poor.

An application of the Chi-Square Test indicated no significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on community organizations by four of the five audiences (Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, Senior 4-H Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee), while significant differences were found in the ratings of County Rural Development Committee. Leaders in this audience rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to community organizations.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Conservation of Natural Resources

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on conservation of natural resources. More than 50.0 percent of the county leaders in each audience rated the area as fair in rural and urban counties.

The Chi-Square Test revealed no significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to conservation of natural resources by all five Extension-related audiences.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to General Community Appearance

Rural and urban counties in general were rated fair on general community appearance. About 50.0 percent or more of county leaders in each audience rated the area as fair in rural and urban counties.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on community appearance by three of the five Extension-related audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee). Each of these audience rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to community appearance. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Land Use Planning and Zoning

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on land use planning and zoning. A majority of county leaders in each audience rated the area as fair in either rural or urban counties while less than 25.0 percent rated the area as good.

An application of the Chi-Square Test revealed no significant differences in ratings of rural and urban counties on land use planning and zoning by all five audiences.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Parks and Playgrounds

Rural and urban counties tended to be rated between high and fair. A higher proportion of county leaders rated the area as either good or fair in each audience in either rural or urban counties.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by three of the five audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents and County Agricultural Extension Committee). Each of these audiences rated urban counties higher than rural counties on parks and playgrounds. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on parks and playgrounds by Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Recreational Opportunities for all Ages

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated between fair and poor on recreational opportunities for all ages. A majority of county leaders in each audience rated the area as fair or poor in either rural or urban counties.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on recreational opportunities for all ages by four of the five audiences. Each of these audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and County Agricultural Extension Committee) rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to recreational opportunities for all ages. No significant differences were found in the ratings of Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Summary Findings: Recreational Opportunities for all Ages

Urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties on three out of seven areas included in recreational opportunities for all ages as rated by Extension-related audiences. On each of the areas (general community appearance, parks and playgrounds and recreational opportunities for all ages), three or more audiences rated urban counties significantly higher than rural counties. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on citizen participation in local government, community organizations, conservation of natural resources, and land use planning and zoning (not significantly different in three or more audiences).

Table Summary: Five Groups of Extension-Related Leaders' Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties Regarding 32 Community Problem Areas

Rural and urban counties were rated significantly different by three or more groups of leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences on 14 out of 32 community problem areas. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on each of the 14 areas.

Review of Table II, page 47, revealed that local agriculture, police protection, conservation of natural resources, land use planning and zoning, and nursing homes were the only problem areas not rated as significantly different in rural and urban counties by all five groups of leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences. Whereas, job training and retraining was the only area rated significantly different in rural and urban counties by all five groups of Extension-related leaders.

One group of Extension-related leaders (Senior 4-H Club Presidents) tended to rate rural and urban counties as not significantly different in the highest number of community problem areas. These groups of leaders' ratings on 26 community problem areas were not significantly different.

County Agricultural Extension Committee members in rural and urban counties had the greatest differences in their ratings. This group of Extension-related leaders rated rural and urban counties significantly different on 19 community problem areas.

CHAPTER VI

COMPARISON OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY NON-EXTENSION-RELATED LEADERS

The purpose of this chapter was to compare rural and urban counties with regard to the ratings of 32 problem areas as perceived by county leaders belonging to all of the non-Extension-related audiences.

Responses from seven groups of county leaders were combined into one group referred to here as non-Extension-related leaders. The seven groups of county leaders were: (1) bankers, (2) county government officials, (3) merchants, (4) ministers, (5) newspaper editors, (6) school principals, and (7) service club presidents.

This chapter is divided into five sections, according to the groupings of the community problem areas. Data are summarized in Table III. The Chi-Square Test was used to test the significance of the differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties by all of the non-Extension-related audiences.

I. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT

Findings regarding six community problem areas are summarized in this section: (1) jobs available, (2) job training and retraining, (3) local agriculture, (4) local industry, (5) local stores, and (6) sources of credit.

TABLE III

NON-EXTENSION-RELATED LEADERS' RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 32 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS

Problem Areas	Rural Counties N	Rural Counties %	Urban Counties N	Urban Counties %
Business, Industry and Employment				
Jobs Available				
Good	119	7.3	78	15.6
Fair	764	46.9	272	54.3
Poor	745	45.8	151	30.1
Total	1628	100.0	501	100.0
	X^2 - 54.73		p - 0.000	
Job Training and Retraining				
Good	182	11.3	73	14.9
Fair	752	46.8	282	57.3
Poor	673	41.9	136	27.7
Total	1607	100.0	491	100.0
	X^2 - 32.13		p - 0.000	
Local Agriculture				
Good	932	57.2	285	57.0
Fair	650	39.9	202	40.4
Poor	47	2.9	13	2.6
Total	1629	100.0	500	100.0
	X^2 - 0.14		p - 0.934	
Local Industry				
Good	454	27.9	198	39.4
Fair	800	49.1	234	46.6
Poor	376	23.1	70	13.9
Total	1630	100.0	502	100.0
	X^2 - 32.61		p - 0.000	
Local Stores				
Good	565	34.6	270	54.0
Fair	865	52.9	197	39.4
Poor	205	12.5	33	6.6
Total	1635	100.0	500	100.0
	X^2 - 63.17		p - 0.000	
Sources of Credit				
Good	944	58.3	297	60.5
Fair	583	36.0	176	35.9
Poor	93	5.7	18	3.7
Total	1620	100.0	491	100.0
	X^2 - 3.40		p - 0.183	
Community Facilities and Services				
Fire Protection				
Good	729	44.7	302	60.2
Fair	713	43.7	162	32.3
Poor	188	11.5	38	7.6
Total	1630	100.0	502	100.0
	X^2 - 36.90		p - 0.000	
Garbage and Trash Disposal				
Good	633	38.8	227	45.3
Fair	740	45.4	211	42.1
Poor	258	15.8	63	12.6
Total	1631	100.0	501	100.0
	X^2 - 7.60		p - 0.022	
Police Protection				
Good	686	42.1	243	48.6
Fair	782	48.0	223	44.6
Poor	163	9.9	34	6.8
Total	1631	100.0	500	100.0
	X^2 - 8.89		p - 0.012	
Public Buildings				
Good	651	39.7	243	48.3
Fair	858	52.3	234	46.5
Poor	132	8.0	26	5.2
Total	1641	100.0	503	100.0
	X^2 - 13.72		p - 0.001	
Public Transportation				
Good	105	6.7	53	11.1
Fair	447	28.5	159	33.2
Poor	1017	64.8	267	55.7
Total	1569	100.0	479	100.0
	X^2 - 16.66		p - 0.000	

TABLE III (Continued)

Problem Areas	Rural Counties N	Rural Counties %	Urban Counties N	Urban Counties %
Road Maintenance				
Good	310	19.1	121	24.3
Fair	852	52.4	274	54.9
Poor	464	28.5	104	20.8
Total	1626	100.0	499	100.0
	X^2 - 13.97		p - 0.001	
Sewage Disposal				
Good	618	38.5	174	35.1
Fair	708	44.1	210	42.3
Poor	278	17.3	112	22.6
Total	1604	100.0	496	100.0
	X^2 - 7.10		p - 0.029	
Water Supply				
Good	1101	67.3	315	62.8
Fair	434	26.5	150	29.9
Poor	100	6.1	37	7.4
Total	1635	100.0	502	100.0
	X^2 - 3.73		p - 0.155	
Family Living				
Children's Day Care				
Good	439	27.7	194	39.3
Fair	806	50.9	245	49.6
Poor	339	21.4	55	11.1
Total	1584	100.0	494	100.0
	X^2 - 37.57		p - 0.000	
Condition of Homes				
Good	607	37.4	249	50.6
Fair	965	59.5	237	48.2
Poor	50	3.1	6	1.2
Total	1622	100.0	492	100.0
	X^2 - 29.67		p - 0.000	
Family Income				
Good	163	10.0	108	21.8
Fair	1094	67.2	342	69.1
Poor	371	22.8	45	9.1
Total	1628	100.0	495	100.0
	X^2 - 77.99		p - 0.000	
Family Living Conditions				
Good	524	32.3	217	43.8
Fair	1047	64.5	271	54.6
Poor	53	3.3	8	1.6
Total	1624	100.0	496	100.0
	X^2 - 23.84		p - 0.000	
Health and Education				
Availability of Doctors and Dentists				
Good	932	57.7	370	73.7
Fair	553	34.0	110	21.0
Poor	134	8.3	22	4.4
Total	1625	100.0	502	100.0
	X^2 - 41.81		p - 0.000	
Availability of Hospitals and Clinics				
Good	941	57.5	356	71.1
Fair	531	32.4	109	21.8
Poor	165	10.1	36	7.2
Total	1637	100.0	501	100.0
	X^2 - 29.69		p - 0.000	
Availability of Public Health Service				
Good	813	50.3	238	47.8
Fair	725	44.8	232	46.6
Poor	79	4.9	28	5.6
Total	1617	100.0	498	100.0
	X^2 - 1.14		p - 0.565	
Education				
Good	780	47.8	281	55.8
Fair	728	44.6	202	40.1
Poor	125	7.6	21	4.1
Total	1633	100.0	504	100.0
	X^2 - 13.60		p - 0.001	

TABLE III (Continued)

Problem Areas	Rural Counties N	Rural Counties %	Urban Counties N	Urban Counties %
Nursing Homes				
Good	969	59.6	277	56.5
Fair	565	34.8	170	34.7
Poor	91	5.6	43	8.8
Total	1625	100.0	490	100.0
	χ^2 - 6.61		p - 0.037	
Public Libraries				
Good	943	57.9	322	64.5
Fair	528	32.4	155	31.1
Poor	158	9.7	22	4.4
Total	1629	100.0	499	100.0
	χ^2 - 15.70		p - 0.000	
School Buildings				
Good	805	49.8	299	59.9
Fair	654	40.4	181	36.3
Poor	159	9.8	19	3.8
Total	1618	100.0	499	100.0
	χ^2 - 25.66		p - 0.000	
Recreational and General Community Environment				
Citizens Participation in Local Government				
Good	233	14.4	99	19.8
Fair	874	54.1	260	52.1
Poor	510	31.5	140	28.1
Total	1617	100.0	499	100.0
	χ^2 - 8.94		p - 0.011	
Community Organizations				
Good	707	43.5	245	48.9
Fair	767	47.2	224	44.7
Poor	150	9.2	32	6.4
Total	1624	100.0	501	100.0
	χ^2 - 6.61		p - 0.037	
Conservation of Natural Resources				
Good	389	24.1	133	27.1
Fair	992	61.5	288	58.8
Poor	231	14.3	69	14.1
Total	1612	100.0	490	100.0
	χ^2 - 1.86		p - 0.395	
General Community Appearance				
Good	544	33.4	200	40.4
Fair	940	57.7	253	51.1
Poor	144	8.9	42	8.5
Total	1628	100.0	495	100.0
	χ^2 - 8.32		p - 0.016	
Land Use Planning and Zoning				
Good	275	17.1	107	21.7
Fair	894	55.7	273	55.3
Poor	437	27.2	114	23.1
Total	1606	100.0	494	100.0
	χ^2 - 6.75		p - 0.034	
Parks and Playgrounds				
Good	636	38.9	208	41.4
Fair	615	37.6	206	41.0
Poor	384	23.5	88	17.5
Total	1635	100.0	502	100.0
	χ^2 - 7.97		p - 0.019	
Recreational Opportunities for all Ages				
Good	422	25.8	161	32.4
Fair	659	40.4	214	43.1
Poor	552	33.8	122	24.6
Total	1633	100.0	497	100.0
	χ^2 - 16.97		p - 0.000	

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Jobs Available

Rural counties appeared to be rated fairly low on jobs available. approximately the same proportion of non-Extension-related audiences rated the area as fair and poor while less than 10.0 percent rated it as good; whereas, urban counties were rated fair by more than half of the county leaders (54.3 percent).

An application of the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of those two counties. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on jobs available.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Job Training and Retraining

Generally, rural counties were rated fairly low on job training and retraining. Approximately the same percentage of non-Extension-related county leaders rated the area as fair and low. Urban counties were rated fair; 57.3 percent of the county leaders rated the area as fair.

An application of the Chi-Square Test indicated significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on job training and retraining. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on job training and retraining.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Agriculture

Both rural and urban counties were rated high on local agriculture by non-Extension-related audiences. Approximately the same percentage of county leaders rated the area as good (57.0 percent) while about 3 percent rated it as poor in rural and urban counties.

The Chi-Square Test indicated no significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on local agriculture as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Industry

Rural and urban counties tended to be rated fair. A majority of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair. A higher percentage of county leaders in urban counties rated the area as good than did county leaders in rural counties.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of rural and urban counties as to local industry were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on local industry as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Local Stores

Rural counties were rated fair on local stores; whereas, urban counties were rated high. A majority of county leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair and good (52.9 percent and 54.0 percent, respectively).

An application of the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on local stores as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Sources of Credit

Rural and urban counties were rated high on sources of credit. The highest percentage of county leaders in rural and urban counties

rated the area as good, while less than 10.0 percent rated it as poor.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test showed that no significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties. Rural and urban counties were rated equally high as to sources of credit by non-Extension-related leaders.

Summary Findings: Business, Industry and Employment

County leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences rated urban counties significantly higher than rural counties on jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, and local stores. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on local agriculture and sources of credit by non-Extension-related leaders.

II. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

This section summarized the ratings of rural and urban counties on eight community problem areas as perceived by county leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences. The areas are: (1) fire protection, (2) garbage and trash disposal, (3) police protection, (4) public buildings, (5) public transportation, (6) road maintenance, (7) sewage disposal, and (8) water supply.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Fire Protection

Rural counties appeared to be rated moderately high as to fire protection. Approximately the same percentage of leaders in rural

counties rated the area as good and fair. urban counties were rated high on fire protection. A majority, or 60.2 percent, of urban county leaders rated the area as good. Fire protection was rated as good, higher in urban counties than in rural counties.

An application of the Chi-Square Test indicated significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to fire protection. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on fire protection as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Garbage and Trash Disposal

Rural counties tended to be rated fair on garbage and trash disposal. A majority of leaders in rural counties rated the area as fair. Urban counties were rated fairly high. Approximately the same percentage of leaders in urban counties rated the area as good and fair. A higher percentage of urban county leaders than rural county leaders rated the area as good (38.8 percent and 45.3 percent, respectively).

When the Chi-Square Test was applied, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to garbage and trash disposal. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on garbage and trash disposal as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Police Protection

Rural counties appeared to be rated fair on police protection; whereas, urban counties were rated high. A majority of leaders in

rural and urban counties rated the area as fair and good, respectively. the ratings showed that a higher percentage of leaders in urban counties rated police protection as good compared to those of rural counties.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, the ratings of rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on police protection by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Buildings

Rural counties were rated fair on public buildings. About half (52.3 percent) of the county leaders rated the area as fair. Urban counties were rated moderately high. About the same proportion of leaders in urban counties rated the area as good and fair (47.0 percent).

Comparison of the ratings by the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to public buildings. Non-Extension-related audiences rated urban counties higher than rural counties with regard to public buildings.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Transportation

Both rural and urban counties were rated low on public transportation. The highest percentage of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as poor (64.8 percent, rural; 55.7 percent, urban). However, a slightly higher percentage of leaders in urban counties rated the area as good than rural counties (11.1 percent and 6.7 percent, respectively).

An application of the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to public transportation. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on public transportation by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Road Maintenance

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on road maintenance. More than 50.0 percent of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair. However, a higher percentage of leaders in urban counties than rural counties rated road maintenance as good.

An application of the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on road maintenance. Non-Extension-related leaders rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to road maintenance.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Sewage Disposal

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair on sewage disposal. A majority of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair (44.1 percent and 42.3 percent, respectively). However, the percentage of rural county leaders who rated the area as good was slightly higher than the percentage of urban county leaders (38.5 percent, rural; 35.1 percent, urban).

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on sewage disposal. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on sewage disposal as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Water Supply

Rural and urban counties were rated high on water supply. The highest percentage of leaders in rural (67.3 percent) and urban (62.8 percent) counties rated the area as good while less than 10.0 percent of both county leaders rated the area as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on water supply as rated by non-Extension-related leaders ($p = 0.155$).

Summary Findings: Community Facilities and Services

Leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences rated rural counties significantly higher than urban counties on one (sewage disposal) out of eight areas included in community facilities and services. However, urban counties were rated significantly higher than rural counties on six areas (fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, police protection, public buildings, public transportation, and road maintenance). The ratings of rural and urban counties on water supply were not significantly different.

III. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF FAMILY LIVING

This section summarized findings from four community problem areas with regard to family living as rated by non-Extension-related leaders. The areas are: (1) children's day care, (2) condition of homes, (3) family income, and (4) family living conditions.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Children's Day Care

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on children's day care. A majority of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair (50.9 percent and 49.6 percent, respectively). A higher percentage of leaders in urban counties than rural counties rated the area as good (39.3 percent, urban; 27.7 percent, rural).

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to children's day care. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on children's day care as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Condition of Homes

Rural counties were rated fair on conditions of homes. The highest percentage of leaders in rural counties rated the area as fair (59.5 percent); whereas, urban counties were rated fairly high. Approximately the same percentage of leaders in urban counties rated the area as good and fair.

An application of the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties as to condition of homes. Non-Extension-related leaders rated urban counties higher than rural counties with regard to condition of homes.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Family Income

Both rural and urban counties were rated fair with regard to family income. A majority of leaders in both rural and urban counties rated the area as fair (67.2 percent, rural; 69.1 percent,

urban). However, a higher percentage of urban county leaders than rural county leaders rated the area as good (21.8 percent and 10.0 percent, respectively).

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test indicated that the ratings of rural and urban counties on family income were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on family income as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Family Living Conditions

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on family living conditions. The area was rated fair by a majority of leaders in both rural and urban counties (64.5 percent and 54.6 percent, respectively). However, a higher proportion of urban county leaders than rural county leaders rated family living conditions as good (43.8 percent, urban; 32.2 percent, rural).

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to family living conditions. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on family living conditions as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Summary Findings: Family Living

The ratings of rural and urban counties were significantly different on each of the four problem areas with regard to family living. County leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences rated urban

counties higher than rural counties on children's day care, condition of homes, family income, and family living conditions.

IV. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF HEALTH AND EDUCATION

The rating of seven community problem areas are included in this section as rated by leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences. The seven areas with regard to health and education are: (1) availability of doctors and dentists, (2) availability of hospitals and clinics, (3) availability of public health services, (4) education, (5) nursing homes, (6) public libraries, and (7) school buildings.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Doctors and Dentists

Both rural and urban counties were rated high on availability of doctors and dentists. The highest percentage of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as good (57.7 percent and 73.7 percent, respectively). Less than 10.0 percent of each rural and urban county leaders rated the area as poor.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to availability of doctors and dentists. Non-Extension-related leaders rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to availability of doctors and dentists.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Hospitals and Clinics

Rural and urban counties were rated high on availability of hospitals and clinics. A majority, or 57.5 percent and 71.1 percent of rural and urban county leaders, rated the area as good.

An application of the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties as to availability of hospitals and clinics as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Availability of Public Health Services

Rural and urban counties were rated fairly high on availability of public health services. In both rural and urban counties, about the same proportion of leaders rated the area as good and fair.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on availability by public health services as rated by non-Extension-related audiences.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Education

Rural counties appeared to be rated moderately high on education. Approximately the same percentage of leaders in rural counties rated education as good (47.8 percent) and fair (44.6 percent). Urban counties were rated high on education. More than half (55.8 percent) of the leaders in urban counties rated education as good.

Comparison of the ratings by the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties. Non-Extension-related leaders rated urban counties higher than rural counties with regard to education.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Nursing Homes

Rural and urban counties were rated high on nursing homes. A majority of leaders in rural counties (59.6 percent) and in urban counties (56.5 percent) rated nursing homes as good. Less than 10.0 percent of rural and urban county leaders rated the area as poor.

The application of the Chi-Square Test indicated significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to nursing homes. Rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on nursing homes as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Public Libraries

Rural and urban counties were rated high on public libraries. A high percentage of leaders in rural (57.9 percent) and urban (64.5 percent) counties rated the area as good while less than 10.0 percent of leaders in each audience rated the area as poor.

Comparison of the ratings by the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties. urban counties tended to be rated higher than rural counties on public libraries as rated by non-Extension-related audiences.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to School Buildings

Rural counties were almost rated high on school buildings. A slightly higher percentage of leaders in rural counties rated the area

as good (49.8 percent) than fair (40.4 percent). urban counties were rated high on school buildings, where the highest percentage of leaders in urban counties rated the area as good (59.9 percent).

The Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties as school buildings by non-Extension-related audiences. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties.

Summary Findings: Health and Education

The findings disclose significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on six areas regarding health and education as rated by non-Extension-related audiences. On one area (nursing homes), rural counties were rated higher than urban counties; whereas, on the other five areas (availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, public libraries, and school buildings) urban counties were rated higher than rural counties. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to availability of public health services.

V. RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES AS TO THE QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND GENERAL COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT

The ratings of seven community problem areas with regard to recreational and general community environment are summarized in this section. The areas are: (1) citizen participation in local government, (2) community organizations, (3) conservation of natural resources,

(4) general community appearance, (5) land use, planning and zoning, (6) parks and playgrounds, and (7) recreational opportunities for all ages.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Citizen Participation in Local Government

A majority of non-Extension-related audiences rated rural and urban counties with regard to citizen participation in local government as fair. About 54.0 percent of leaders in rural counties and 52.0 percent in urban counties rated the area as fair. However, a higher percentage of urban county leaders rated the area as good compared to rural county leaders (19.8 percent and 14.4 percent, respectively).

The Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on citizens' participation in local government. Non-Extension-related leaders tended to rate urban counties higher than rural counties as to citizens participation in local government.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Community Organizations

Rural counties tended to be rated moderately high on community organizations. The percentages of good (43.5 percent) and fair (47.2 percent) ratings of community organization by leaders in rural counties were about the same. urban counties also appeared to be rated moderately high on community organizations. The percentage of leaders in urban counties who rated the area as good and fair were approximately

the same. However, a slightly higher percentage of urban county leaders (48.9 percent) than rural county leaders rated the area as good.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban county leaders on community organizations ($p = 0.037$). Urban counties appeared to be rated higher than rural counties with regard to community organizations as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Conservation of Natural Resources

Rural and urban counties were rated fair on conservation of natural resources. A majority of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair (61.5 percent and 58.8 percent, respectively).

Comparison of the ratings by the Chi-Square Test showed that no significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties on conservation of natural resources ($p = 0.395$). Non-Extension-related leaders rated rural and urban counties about equal as to conservation of natural resources.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to General Community Appearance

A majority of leaders rated rural and urban counties as fair with regard to general community appearance. A majority, or 57.7 percent of leaders in rural counties and 51.1 percent in urban counties, rated the area as fair while less than 10.0 percent of leaders in each county rated the area as poor. A slightly higher proportion of leaders

in urban counties than rural counties rated the area as good (40.4 percent, urban; 33.4 percent, rural).

An application to the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to general community appearance. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on general community appearance by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Land Use Planning and Zoning

In general, rural and urban counties were rated fair on land use planning and zoning. More than half of leaders in rural counties (55.7 percent) and in urban counties (55.3 percent) rated the area as fair. However, a slightly higher percentage of leaders in urban counties than rural counties rated the area as good (21.7 percent, urban; 17.1 percent, rural).

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to land use planning and zoning. Non-Extension-related leaders appeared to rate urban counties higher than rural counties on land use planning and zoning.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Parks and Playgrounds

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated moderately high on parks and playgrounds. Approximately the same percentage of leaders in each county rated the area as good and fair (38.0 percent, rural;

41.0 percent, urban). Less than 25.0 percent of leaders in each county rated the area as poor.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to parks and playgrounds. Urban counties appeared to be rated higher than rural counties on parks and playgrounds as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties with Regard to Recreational Opportunities for All Ages

Rural and urban counties appeared to be rated fair. About 40.0 percent and 43.0 percent of leaders in rural and urban counties rated the area as fair. However, the percentage of leaders in urban counties who rated the area as good (32.4 percent) was higher than those in rural counties (25.8 percent).

An application of the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties on recreational opportunities for all ages. Non-Extension-related leaders rated urban counties higher than rural counties on recreational opportunities for all ages as rated by non-Extension-related leaders.

Summary Findings: Recreational and General Community Environment

County leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences rated urban counties significantly higher than rural counties on six out of seven areas included in recreational and general community environment. The six areas were: citizen participation in local government, community organizations, general community appearance,

land use planning and zoning, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunities for all ages. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to conservation of natural resources by non-Extension-related leaders.

Table Summary: All Non-Extension-Related Leaders' Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties Regarding 32 Community Problem Areas

Rural and urban counties were rated significantly different on 27 out of 32 community problem areas by all groups of leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on 25 community problem areas; whereas, rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on the other two areas (sewage disposal and nursing homes).

Non-Extension-related leaders in rural counties rated local agriculture, sources of credit, water supply, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, availability of public health services, nursing homes, public libraries, and school buildings as good; whereas, public transportation was rated poor.

Urban county leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences rated local agriculture, local stores, sources of credit, fire protection, condition of homes, availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, nursing homes, public libraries, and school buildings as good; while, public transportation was rated poor.

CHAPTER VII

COMPARISON BETWEEN 1979 AND 1984 LEADERS' RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 28 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS AS PERCEIVED BY 12 GROUPS OF LEADERS

The purpose of this chapter was to compare 1979 with 1984 regarding 28 common community problem areas as perceived by all 12 groups of leaders in rural and in urban counties.

The chapter is divided into five sections which include the findings of 28 common community problem areas in 1979 and 1984. The sections are: (1) business, industry and employment, (2) community facilities and services, (3) family living, (4) health and education, and (5) recreational and general community environment.

The Chi-Square Test was used to test the significance of the differences between 1979 and 1984 ratings of rural and urban counties on each of the 28 common community problem areas. Data pertaining to Chapter VII are presented in Table IV.

I. COMPARISON OF 1979 WITH 1984 AS TO THE QUALITY OF BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT IN RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES

Leaders' ratings of six community problem areas with regard to business, industry and employment are summarized in this section: (1) jobs available, (2) job training and retraining, (3) local agriculture, (4) local stores, (5) local industry, and (6) sources of credit.

The findings are reported under two subsections: (1) ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties with regard to business industry and

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF 1979 WITH 1984 LEADERS' RATINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES REGARDING 28 COMMUNITY PROBLEM AREAS

Problem Areas	Rural Counties				Urban Counties			
	1979*		1984		1979*		1984	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Business, Industry and Employment								
Jobs Available								
Good	557	18.8	270	7.8	333	28.6	187	17.2
Fair	1402	47.3	1530	44.3	605	51.9	597	55.0
Poor	1005	33.9	1658	48.0	227	19.5	301	27.7
Total	2964	100.0	3458	100.0	1165	100.0	1085	100.0
	X^2 - 228.66		p - 0.000		X^2 - 48.63		p - 0.000	
Job Training and Retraining								
Good	365	12.4	395	11.6	259	22.5	170	16.4
Fair	1430	48.6	1554	45.6	628	54.5	569	55.0
Poor	1148	39.0	1459	42.8	266	23.0	296	28.6
Total	2943	100.0	3408	100.0	1153	100.0	1035	100.0
	X^2 - 9.44		p - 0.009		X^2 - 16.66		p - 0.000	
Local Agriculture								
Good	1844	62.3	1934	56.0	693	59.8	633	58.8
Fair	1068	36.1	1421	41.1	447	38.5	413	38.4
Poor	50	1.7	99	2.9	20	1.7	30	2.8
Total	2962	100.0	3454	100.0	1160	100.0	1076	100.0
	X^2 - 30.775		p - 0.000		X^2 - 2.91		p - 0.234	
Local Stores								
Good	998	33.7	1144	33.0	600	51.4	603	55.6
Fair	1637	55.2	1826	52.3	504	43.2	407	37.5
Poor	328	11.1	503	14.5	63	5.4	75	6.9
Total	2963	100.0	3473	100.0	1167	100.0	1085	100.0
	X^2 - 16.81		p - 0.000		X^2 - 8.41		p - 0.015	
Sources of Credit								
Good	1622	54.9	1873	54.8	704	60.5	639	60.7
Fair	1157	39.2	1340	39.2	412	35.5	376	35.7
Poor	173	5.9	204	6.0	46	4.0	38	3.6
Total	2952	100.0	3417	100.0	1162	100.0	1053	100.0
	X^2 - 0.04		p - 0.981		X^2 - 0.19		p - 0.910	
Local Industry								
Good	1115	37.6	957	27.6	627	53.9	473	43.7
Fair	1256	42.4	1645	47.5	430	36.9	479	44.2
Poor	592	20.0	862	24.9	107	9.2	131	12.1
Total	2963	100.0	3464	100.0	1164	100.0	1083	100.0
	X^2 - 75.75		p - 0.000		X^2 - 23.73		p - 0.000	

TABLE IV (Continued)

Problem Areas	Rural Counties 1979* N	%	Rural Counties 1984 N	%	Urban Counties 1979* N	%	Urban Counties 1984 N	%
Community Facilities and Services								
Fire Protection								
Good	1044	35.3	1386	40.1	517	44.3	575	58.8
Fair	1305	44.0	1544	44.7	474	40.7	413	37.9
Poor	615	20.7	525	15.2	175	15.0	101	9.3
Total	2964	100.0	3455	100.0	1166	100.0	1089	100.0
	X^2 - 37.95		p - 0.000		X^2 - 24.52		p - 0.000	
Garbage and Trash Disposal								
Good	1026	34.6	1207	35.0	365	31.1	455	41.9
Fair	1188	40.0	1577	45.7	515	44.2	473	43.6
Poor	754	25.4	670	19.4	286	24.5	158	14.6
Total	2968	100.0	3454	100.0	1166	100.0	1086	100.0
	X^2 - 37.79		p - 0.000		X^2 - 45.78		p - 0.000	
Public Buildings								
Good	902	30.5	1297	37.3	444	38.2	535	49.2
Fair	1747	59.0	1840	53.0	608	52.3	491	45.2
Poor	313	10.5	338	9.7	110	9.5	61	5.6
Total	2962	100.0	3475	100.0	1162	100.0	1087	100.0
	X^2 - 33.65		p - 0.000		X^2 - 32.49		p - 0.000	
Public Transportation								
Good	406	13.8	232	6.9	181	15.6	111	10.7
Fair	1359	46.2	951	28.5	531	45.9	345	33.3
Poor	1175	40.0	2160	64.6	446	38.5	580	56.0
Total	2940	100.0	3343	100.0	1158	100.0	1036	100.0
	X^2 - 386.18		p - 0.000		X^2 - 67.20		p - 0.000	
Road Maintenance								
Good	282	9.5	648	18.7	149	12.8	225	23.8
Fair	1307	44.0	2107	60.9	569	48.8	605	55.6
Poor	1381	46.5	1087	31.4	447	38.4	259	23.8
Total	2970	100.0	3462	100.0	1165	100.0	1089	100.0
	X^2 - 259.15		p - 0.000		X^2 - 64.12		p - 0.000	
Sewage Disposal								
Good	841	28.7	1134	33.7	297	25.7	338	32.1
Fair	1380	47.1	1518	45.2	568	49.3	454	43.1
Poor	709	24.2	709	21.1	289	25.0	262	24.9
Total	2930	100.0	3361	100.0	1154	100.0	1054	100.0
	X^2 - 20.61		p - 0.000		X^2 - 12.18		p - 0.002	
Water Supply								
Good	1705	57.6	2190	63.4	731	62.6	660	60.2
Fair	1018	34.4	1001	29.0	368	31.6	344	31.4
Poor	236	8.0	265	7.7	68	5.8	92	8.4
Total	2959	100.0	3456	100.0	1161	100.0	1096	100.0
	X^2 - 23.85		p - 0.000		X^2 - 5.81		p - 0.055	

TABLE IV (Continued)

Problem Areas	Rural Counties 1979* N	Rural Counties 1979* %	Rural Counties 1984 N	Rural Counties 1984 %	Urban Counties 1979* N	Urban Counties 1979* %	Urban Counties 1984 N	Urban Counties 1984 %
Family Living								
Condition of Homes								
Good	728	24.6	1186	34.4	396	34.0	564	52.4
Fair	2082	70.2	2099	60.9	736	63.1	497	46.2
Poor	155	5.2	164	4.8	34	2.9	16	1.5
Total	2965	100.0	3449	100.0	1166	100.0	1077	100.0
	χ^2 - 73.82		p - 0.000		χ^2 - 78.80		p - 0.000	
Family Income								
Good	387	13.1	321	9.3	287	24.6	262	24.3
Fair	2016	68.2	2309	67.1	783	67.2	728	67.5
Poor	553	18.7	810	23.6	95	8.2	88	8.2
Total	2956	100.0	3440	100.0	1165	100.0	1078	100.0
	χ^2 - 38.05		p - 0.000		χ^2 - 0.03		p - 0.983	
Family Living Conditions								
Good	856	29.0	1041	30.2	433	37.2	465	43.3
Fair	1975	66.9	2272	66.0	697	59.9	590	54.9
Poor	122	4.1	131	3.8	34	2.9	20	1.9
Total	2953	100.0	3444	100.0	1164	100.0	1075	100.0
	χ^2 - 1.45		p - 0.483		χ^2 - 10.14		p - 0.006	
Health and Education								
Availability of Doctors and Dentists								
Good	1033	34.8	1869	54.0	606	51.9	811	74.1
Fair	1261	42.5	1232	35.6	427	36.6	227	20.8
Poor	673	22.7	361	10.4	134	11.5	56	5.1
Total	2967	100.0	3462	100.0	1167	100.0	1094	100.0
	χ^2 - 298.97		p - 0.000		χ^2 - 120.61		p - 0.000	
Availability of Hospitals and Clinics								
Good	1099	37.1	1926	55.4	613	52.5	771	70.9
Fair	1247	42.0	1142	32.8	408	34.9	231	21.3
Poor	620	20.9	409	11.8	147	12.6	85	7.8
Total	2966	100.0	3477	100.0	1168	100.0	1087	100.0
	χ^2 - 234.92		p - 0.000		χ^2 - 80.83		p - 0.000	
Availability of Public Health Services								
Good	1358	45.9	1671	48.7	579	49.7	518	48.6
Fair	1374	46.4	1584	46.1	503	43.3	491	46.1
Poor	227	7.7	179	5.2	82	7.0	57	5.3
Total	2959	100.0	3434	100.0	1164	100.0	1066	100.0
	χ^2 - 17.73		p - 0.000		χ^2 - 3.73		p - 0.155	
Education								
Good	1140	38.5	1440	41.5	509	43.8	570	52.2
Fair	1558	52.6	1695	48.8	523	45.0	471	43.1
Poor	265	8.9	336	9.7	129	11.2	52	4.8
Total	2963	100.0	3471	100.0	1161	100.0	1093	100.0
	χ^2 - 8.99		p - 0.011		χ^2 - 36.91		p - 0.000	

TABLE IV (Continued)

Problem Areas	Rural Counties 1979* N	Rural Counties 1979* %	Rural Counties 1984 N	Rural Counties 1984 %	Urban Counties 1979* N	Urban Counties 1979* %	Urban Counties 1984 N	Urban Counties 1984 %
Nursing Homes								
Good	1143	38.7	1877	54.7	466	40.1	558	52.6
Fair	1282	43.3	1247	36.3	538	46.3	416	39.3
Poor	531	18.0	309	9.0	158	13.6	86	8.1
Total	2956	100.0	3433	100.0	1162	100.0	1060	100.0
	X^2 - 203.07		p - 0.000		X^2 - 40.52		p - 0.000	
Recreational and General Community Environment								
Community Organizations								
Good	1040	35.2	1351	39.1	507	43.7	216	20.1
Fair	1499	50.7	1701	49.3	546	47.1	587	54.6
Poor	417	14.1	402	16.6	107	9.2	273	25.4
Total	2956	100.0	3454	100.0	1160	100.0	1081	100.0
	X^2 - 14.88		p - 0.001		X^2 - 188.23		p - 0.000	
Conservation of Natural Resources								
Good	768	26.1	783	22.9	306	26.5	273	26.1
Fair	1726	58.7	2081	60.8	672	58.3	723	59.6
Poor	446	15.2	558	16.3	175	15.2	150	14.3
Total	2940	100.0	3422	100.0	1153	100.0	1046	100.0
	X^2 - 9.28		p - 0.010		X^2 - 0.45		p - 0.707	
Land Use Planning and Zoning								
Good	470	16.1	525	15.7	196	17.1	199	19.0
Fair	1648	56.6	1855	55.5	654	57.0	611	58.2
Poor	795	27.3	964	28.8	297	25.9	240	22.9
Total	2913	100.0	3344	100.0	1147	100.0	1050	100.0
	X^2 - 1.83		p - 0.401		X^2 - 3.26		p - 0.196	
Parks and Playgrounds								
Good	775	26.2	1283	37.1	441	37.8	428	39.3
Fair	1225	41.4	1267	36.6	514	44.0	478	44.0
Poor	959	32.4	913	26.4	213	18.2	182	16.7
Total	2959	100.0	3463	100.0	1168	100.0	1088	100.0
	X^2 - 88.22		p - 0.000		X^2 - 1.10		p - 0.577	
Recreational Opportunities for All Ages								
Good	559	19.0	774	22.3	320	27.8	325	30.1
Fair	1192	40.7	1399	40.3	546	47.4	508	47.0
Poor	1180	40.3	1296	37.4	285	24.8	247	22.9
Total	2931	100.0	3469	100.0	1151	100.0	1080	100.0
	X^2 - 11.51		p - 0.003		X^2 - 1.87		p - 0.393	

*Amonett (1:30-35).

employment, and (2) ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties with regard to business, industry and employment.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Rural Counties with Regard to Business, Industry and Employment

Rural counties were rated high in 1979 and 1984 on local agriculture and sources of credit. The majority of rural county leaders in 1979 and 1984 rated each of these areas as good. On the other four areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local stores, and local industry), rural counties in both time periods appeared to be rated fairly. Within each of these four areas, the majority of rural county leaders rated the area as fair.

When the ratings of each six areas were compared between the two time periods, the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in four of the areas. Rural counties appeared to be rated higher in 1979 than 1984 in jobs available, job training and retraining, local agriculture, local stores, and local industry. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of sources of credit. Rural counties were rated equally high in 1979 and 1984 as to sources of credit.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Urban Counties with Regard to Business, Industry and Employment

Urban counties were rated high in 1979 and 1984 on three areas included in business, industry and employment. More than half of the rural county leaders in both time periods rated local agriculture, local stores and sources of credit as good; whereas, local industry

was only rated high in 1979, as the majority of urban county leaders rated it as good. Urban counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated fair on the other two areas (jobs available and job training and retraining).

The application of the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties as to four areas with regard to business, industry and employment. Urban counties in 1979 appeared to be rated higher than in 1984 on jobs available, job training and retraining, and local industry; however, urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than 1979 on local stores. No significant differences were found in the ratings of local agriculture and sources of credit ($p = 0.234$ and $p = 0.910$).

II. COMPARISON OF 1979 WITH 1984 AS TO THE QUALITY OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES IN RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES

This section summarized the findings of seven community problem areas included in community facilities and services. The areas are: (1) fire protection, (2) garbage and trash disposal, (3) public buildings, (4) public transportation, (5) road maintenance, (6) sewage disposal, and (7) water supply.

The findings are reported under two subsections which are: (1) ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties with regard to community facilities and services, and (2) ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties with regard to community facilities and services.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Rural Counties with Regard to Community Facilities and Services

Rural counties were rated fair in 1979 and 1984 in four areas with regard to community facilities and services. A majority of rural county leaders in 1979 and 1984 rated fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings and sewage disposal as fair. However, rural counties were rated high in 1979 and 1984 on water supply. On the other two areas (public transportation and road maintenance), 1979 rural counties were rated fairly low due to the majority of rural county leaders in each area rating them as fair and poor. However, more than 50.0 percent of rural county leaders in 1984 rated public transportation as poor and road maintenance as fair.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties on all seven areas included in community facilities and services. It appeared that rural counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on six problem areas, which were fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, road maintenance, sewage disposal and water supply. Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 on public transportation.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Urban Counties with Regard to Community Facilities and Services

Urban counties in 1979 were rated as fair on six out of seven areas included in community facilities and services (i.e., fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, public transportation, road maintenance and sewage disposal). The majority

of urban county leaders in 1979 rated each of the six areas as fair. On the other hand, the 1979 urban counties were rated high concerning water supply. A highest, or 62.6, percent of urban county leaders in 1979 rated the area as good. Rural counties in 1984 appeared to be rated high on four of the seven areas (i.e., fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, and water supply). However, the counties were rated fair on road maintenance and sewage disposal and poor on public transportation.

The Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties on six problem areas. Urban counties were rated higher in 1979 than 1984 on public transportation; whereas, urban counties were rated higher in 1984 than 1979 concerning fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, road maintenance, and sewage disposal. No significant differences were found in the ratings of water supply ($p = 0.055$).

III. COMPARISON OF 1979 WITH 1984 AS TO THE QUALITY OF FAMILY LIVING IN RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES

This section summarized findings from three problem areas with regard to family living. The three areas which were common in 1979 and 1984 CRD surveys are: (1) condition of homes, (2) family income, and (3) family living conditions.

Section III is divided into two subsections which are: (1) ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties with regard to family living and (2) ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties with regard to family living.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Rural Counties with Regard to Family Living

Rural counties were rated fair in 1979 and 1984 on all three areas with regard to family living. Condition of homes, family incomes, and family living conditions were rated as fair with the largest proportions by rural county leaders in both time periods.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to these data, significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties with regard to two problem areas. Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than rural counties in 1984 as to family income; whereas, rural counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on condition of homes. No significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties concerning family living conditions.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Urban Counties with Regard to Family Living

Urban counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated fair on family income and family living conditions. The fair ratings of each area received more than 50.0 percent of urban county leaders' votes in both time periods. As to condition of homes, 1979 urban counties were also rated fair, while 1984 urban counties were rated high. The largest percentage of urban county leaders in both time periods rated the area as fair and good, respectively.

Comparison by the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences existed in two of the three areas. Urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on condition of homes and family living conditions. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties concerning family income.

IV. COMPARISON OF 1979 WITH 1984 AS TO THE QUALITY OF HEALTH AND EDUCATION IN RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES

Seven common community problem areas found in 1979 and 1984 CRD surveys with regard to health and education are summarized in Section IV. The areas are: (1) availability of doctors and dentists, (2) availability of hospitals and clinics, (3) availability of public health service, (4) education, (5) nursing homes, (6) public libraries, and (7) school buildings.

The findings are reported under two subsections: (1) ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties with regard to health and education and (2) ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties with regard to health and education.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Rural Counties with Regard to Health and Education

Rural counties in 1979 tended to be rated fair on six out of seven areas included in health and education, while on one area (public libraries), the counties were rated high. On the other hand, rural counties in 1984 appeared to be rated pretty high on all the seven areas. The majority of rural county leaders in 1984 rated each of the seven areas as good and fair.

The application of the Chi-Square Test showed significant differences in the ratings of rural counties in 1979 and 1984 on all seven areas. Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 on availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and

clinics, availability of public health services, education, nursing homes, public libraries, and school buildings.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Urban Counties with Regard to Health and Education

Urban counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated high on three out of seven areas with regard to health and education. On these three areas (availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, and public libraries), the highest percentage of rural county leaders rated each of the areas as good. On the other hand, urban counties in 1979 were rated moderately high on the other four areas (availability of public health services, education, nursing homes, and school buildings). Urban counties in 1984 were rated high on nursing homes, school buildings, and education; whereas, the counties were rated moderately high on availability of public health services.

Comparison between 1979 and 1984 urban counties by the Chi-Square Test found significant differences on six of the areas. Urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, nursing homes, public libraries, and school buildings. No significant differences were found in the ratings of availability of public health services.

V. COMPARISON OF 1979 WITH 1984 AS TO THE QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND GENERAL COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT IN RURAL AND URBAN COUNTIES

Section V summarized findings of five community problem areas with regard to recreational and general community environment. The

five areas are: (1) community organizations, (2) conservation of natural resources, (3) land use planning and zoning, (4) parks and playgrounds, and (5) recreational opportunities for all ages.

The findings are reported under two subsections: (1) ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties with regard to recreational and general community environment and (2) ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties with regard to recreational and general community environment.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Rural Counties with Regard to Recreational and General Community Environment

Rural counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated moderately on three areas included in recreational and general community environment. More than 50.0 percent of rural county leaders in both time periods rated each of these areas (community organizations, conservation of natural resources, and land use planning and zoning) as being fair. Rural counties in 1979 appeared to be rated fair on parks and playgrounds and fairly low on recreational opportunities for all ages. On the other two areas, 1984 rural counties tended to be rated moderately high on parks and playgrounds, and moderately low on recreational opportunities for all ages.

The application of the Chi-Square Test revealed significant differences on four out of the five areas. Rural counties in 1979 appeared to be rated higher than rural counties in 1984 on conservation of natural resources; whereas, rural counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on community organizations, parks and playgrounds and recreational opportunities for all ages. No significant differences

were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties concerning land use planning and zoning.

Ratings of 1979 and 1984 Urban Counties with Regard to Recreational and General Community Environment

Urban counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated about fair on all five areas included in recreational and general community environment. The majority of urban county leaders in both time periods rated each five areas as fair.

When the Chi-Square Test was applied to the data, significant differences were found only in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties on one area. Urban counties in 1979 appeared to be rated higher than in 1984 on community organizations. No significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties on conservation of natural resources, land use planning and zoning, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunities for all ages.

Table Summary: 1979 and 1984 Leaders' Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties Regarding 28 Community Problem Areas as Perceived by all 12 Groups of County Leaders

Rural counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated significantly different with regard to 25 our of 28 community problem areas. Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than 1984 on 8 of these 25 areas. Five of the eight areas came in the category of business, industry and employment (i.e., jobs available, job training and retraining, local agriculture, local stores, and local industry). However, rural counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on 17 community problem areas.

A higher proportion of these 17 areas were in two categories (community facilities and services, 6 areas; health and education, 7 areas).

Urban counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated significantly different on 19 community problem areas by all groups of leaders surveyed. Urban counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 with regard to five community problem areas (jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, public transportation, and community organizations). Whereas, urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on 14 community problem areas. A majority of these 14 areas were in two categories (community facilities and services, 5 areas; health and education, 6 areas).

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY

I. PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

Purpose

The main purpose of this study was to identify differences and similarities between Tennessee's rural and urban counties as to leaders' perception of the quality of 32 selected community problem areas.

Specific Objectives

The specific objectives were divided into four categories. While the first three specific objectives were limited to data obtained in 1984, the fourth and last objective was related to data obtained in 1979 and 1984. The specific objectives were to compare rural and urban counties with regard to the ratings of 32 problem areas as perceived by:

1. All 12 groups of leaders,
2. Five groups of leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences,
3. All of the non-Extension-related audiences.

The fourth objective was to compare 1979 with 1984 regarding 28 common community problem areas as perceived by all 12 groups of leaders in rural and urban counties.

II. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Population and Sample

The population of this study included 4616 county leaders belonging to 12 groups of community leaders living in 94 Tennessee counties. The sample and the recommended size from each county were as follows: (1) Bankers (all), (2) County Agricultural Extension Committee (all), (3) County Government Officials (judges and four officials), (4) County Rural Development Committee (all), (5) Community Club Presidents (all), (6) Home Demonstration Club Presidents (all), (7) Merchants (five representatives), (8) Ministers (five representatives), (9) Newspaper Editors (all), (10) School Principals (all), (11) Service Club Presidents (all), and (12) Senior 4-H Club Presidents (all).

Data Collection

Data were collected by mail questionnaire prepared by specialists at TAES during the Summer of 1984. There were 32 areas of concern included in the questionnaire (see Appendix). Respondents were asked to rate each of the areas (good, fair and poor) as they perceived the average residents see the areas.

Data Analysis

The 4616 returned questionnaires were processed and entered into the computer by specialists at the Extension Education Department of TAES. The data were analyzed on the basis of rating percentages between rural and urban counties and their significance of the differences were tested by the Chi-Square Test. Probability achieving the 0.05 level was considered significant.

III. MAJOR FINDINGS

Findings are classified under four headings according to the specific objectives of the study. The headings were major findings regarding the ratings of rural and urban counties on 32 community problem areas as perceived by: (1) all 12 groups of leaders, (2) five groups of leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences, and (3) all of the non-Extension-related audiences. The fourth heading was major findings regarding 1979 and 1984 leaders' ratings of rural and urban counties on 28 community problem areas as perceived by 12 groups of county leaders.

Major Findings Regarding the Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties on 32 Community Problem Areas as Perceived by all 12 Groups of Leaders

Business, industry and employment. The ratings of rural and urban counties were significantly different on five of the six areas regarding business, industry and employment. The areas in which the ratings differed were: jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, local stores, and sources of credit. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on these four problem areas. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on local agriculture.

Community facilities and services. The findings indicate that rural and urban counties' ratings on seven out of eight areas were significantly different. Rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on sewage disposal; whereas, urban counties were rated higher

than rural counties on fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, police protection, public buildings, public transportation, and road maintenance. There were no significant differences in the ratings of water supply between rural and urban counties.

Family living. The ratings of rural and urban counties were significantly different in all four areas with regard to family living. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on children's day care, condition of homes, family income, and family living conditions.

Health and education. Significant differences were found between rural and urban counties' ratings of five out of seven areas with regard to health and education. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on all five areas (availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, public libraries, and school buildings). No significant differences were found between rural and urban counties' ratings of availability of public health services and nursing homes.

Recreational and general community environment. Rural and urban counties differed significantly in their ratings with regard to six out of seven areas included in recreational and general community environment. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on citizen participation in local government, community organizations, general community appearance, land use planning and zoning, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunity for all ages. No significant differences were found in the ratings of conservation of natural resources.

Major Findings Regarding the Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties on 32 Community Problem Areas as Perceived by Five Groups of Leaders Belonging to Extension-Related Audiences

Business, industry and employment.

1. Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties with regard to jobs available, local industry and local stores within each four of the five audiences. County leaders belonging to the County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and the County Agriculture Extension Committee rated urban counties higher than rural counties on all three areas. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties (belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents) in the areas of jobs available, local industry and local stores.

2. The ratings of job training and retraining in rural and urban counties as rated by county leaders belonging to all five audiences were significantly different. County leaders belonging to each audience rated urban counties higher than rural counties as to job training and retraining.

3. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties concerning local agriculture in any of the five groups of Extension-related audiences.

4. The ratings of sources of credit in rural and urban counties by county leaders belonging to the County Rural Development Committee were significantly different. Urban counties were rated

higher than rural counties. However, no significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by county leaders belonging to the other four audiences with regard to sources of credit.

Community facilities and services.

1. No significant differences were found in rural and urban counties' ratings of fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, and public transportation within each four of the audiences (County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, Community Club Presidents, and Senior 4-H Club Presidents). On the other hand, the ratings of urban counties by leaders belonging to the County Agriculture Extension Committee were significantly higher than the ratings of rural counties in all three areas.

2. The ratings of police protection in rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to all five audiences were not significantly different.

3. Except for the groups of Community Club Presidents, the ratings of public buildings in rural and urban counties by each of the other four audiences were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties.

4. Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on road maintenance within two of the five audiences. County leaders belonging to Home Demonstration Club Presidents rated rural counties higher than urban counties; whereas, county leaders belonging to the County Agriculture Extension Committee rated urban counties higher than rural counties with regard to road maintenance.

No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties' ratings of road maintenance within the other three audiences.

5. The ratings of sewage disposal in rural and urban counties within two audiences were significantly different. County leaders of the Home Demonstration Club Presidents rated urban counties higher than rural counties; whereas, rural counties belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents rated rural counties higher than did urban counties. No significant differences were found in the ratings of sewage disposal in the ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to the other three audiences.

6. County leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents rated water supply significantly different in rural and urban counties. Rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on water supply. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties' ratings of water supply within the other four audiences.

Family living.

1. Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on children's day care within three audiences. County leaders within the County Rural Development Committee, Home Demonstration Club Presidents, and County Agriculture Extension Committee rated urban counties higher than rural counties on children's day care. No significant differences existed in rural and urban counties' ratings of children's day care within the other two audiences.

2. There were significant differences in the ratings of rural and urban counties' ratings of conditions of homes within two audiences. County leaders within Home Demonstration Club Presidents and Community Club Presidents rated urban counties higher than rural counties on condition of homes. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to the other three audiences.

3. The ratings of family income in rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to four audiences were significantly different. County leaders within all four audiences rated urban counties higher than rural counties on family income. No significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

4. Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on family living conditions by leaders belonging to one audience. County leaders belonging to Home Demonstration Club Presidents rated urban counties higher than rural counties on family living conditions. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to the other four audiences.

Health and education.

1. County leaders belonging to four audiences rated rural and urban counties on availability of doctors and dentists significantly different. County leaders within the four audiences rated urban counties higher than rural counties on availability of doctors and dentists.

No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban county leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

2. The ratings of availability of hospitals and clinics in rural and urban county leaders belonging to three audiences were significantly different. County leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents rated rural counties higher than urban counties' leaders; whereas, county leaders within the County Agriculture Extension Committee rated urban counties higher than the rural counties. The ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to the other three audiences were not significantly different.

4. The ratings of availability of public health services in rural and urban counties within two audiences were significantly different. The ratings of urban counties by leaders belonging to the County Rural Development Committee, Senior 4-H Club Presidents, and the County Agriculture Extension Committee were higher than the ratings of rural counties within the same audiences on availability of public health services. No significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to the other two audiences.

5. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on nursing homes between leaders in rural and urban counties within each of the five audiences.

6. Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on public libraries between leaders in rural and urban counties within two audiences. Urban leaders belonging to the County Rural Development Committee and Home Demonstration Club Presidents rated public libraries higher in urban counties than rural

counties. The ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to the other three audiences were not significantly different.

7. County leaders belonging to two audiences rated school buildings significantly different. County leaders belonging to the County Rural Development Committee and the County Agriculture Extension Committee rated urban counties higher than rural counties. No significant differences were found in rural and urban counties' ratings of school buildings within the other three audiences.

Recreational and general community environment.

1. Significant differences were found in rural and urban counties' ratings of citizen participation in local government within one audience. County leaders within Home Demonstration Club Presidents rated urban counties higher than rural counties. The ratings of rural and urban counties on citizen participation in local government within the other four audiences were not significantly different.

2. Except for the County Rural Development Committee, no significant differences were found in rural and urban counties' ratings of community organization within the other four audiences. County leaders belonging to the County Rural Development Committee rated community organizations higher in urban counties than in rural counties.

3. No significant differences were found between rural and urban counties' ratings of conservation of natural resources and land use planning and zoning in any of the five audiences.

4. County leaders belonging to three audiences rated general community appearance and parks and playgrounds significantly different in rural and urban counties. County leaders belonging to the County

Rural Development Committee, Community Club Presidents and the County Agriculture Extension Committee rated urban counties higher than rural counties on general community appearance and parks and playgrounds. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on those two areas by leaders belonging to the other two audiences.

5. Significant differences were found between rural and urban counties' ratings of recreational opportunity for all ages within four audiences. County leaders belonging to the four audiences rated urban counties higher than rural county. No significant differences existed in the ratings of rural and urban counties by leaders belonging to Senior 4-H Club Presidents.

Major Findings Regarding the Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties on 32 Problem Areas as Perceived by all Leaders Belonging to Non-Extension-Related Audiences

Business, industry and employment. The ratings of jobs available, job training and retraining, local industry, and local stores were significantly different in rural and urban counties as rated by leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences. Urban counties were rated higher than the rural counties with regard to all four areas. No significant differences were found between rural and urban counties' ratings of local agriculture and sources of credit.

Community facilities and services. County leaders differed significantly in their ratings of rural and urban counties on seven areas with regard to community facilities and services. Urban counties

were rated higher than rural counties concerning fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, police protection, public buildings, public transportation, and road maintenance; whereas, rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on sewage disposal. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on water supply.

Family living. The ratings of all four areas with regard to family living between rural and urban counties were significantly different. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on children's day care, condition of homes, family incomes, and family living conditions.

Health and education. Significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on five areas included in health and education. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, public libraries, and school buildings; whereas, rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on nursing homes. No significant differences were found in the ratings of rural and urban counties on availability of public health services.

Recreational and general community environment. The ratings of rural and urban counties differed significantly concerning six areas included in recreational and general community environment. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on citizen participation

in local government, community organizations, general community appearance, land use planning and zoning, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunity for all ages. No significant differences were found in the ratings of conservation of natural resources in rural and urban counties.

Major findings Regarding 1979 and 1984 Leaders' Ratings of Rural and Urban Counties on 28 Common Community Problem Areas as Perceived by all 12 Groups of County Leaders

Business, industry and employment. Significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties on five areas included in business, industry and employment. Jobs available, job training and retraining, local agriculture, local stores, and local industry were rated higher in 1979 than in 1984 by rural counties. No significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties on sources of credit.

Urban counties in 1979 and 1984 differed significantly with regard to four out of six areas. Urban counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 with regard to jobs available and job training and retraining. However, urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on local stores and local industry. The ratings of two areas (local agriculture and sources of credit) were not rated significantly different between 1979 and 1984 urban counties.

Community facilities and services. The ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties were rated significantly different in each of seven areas

included in community facilities and services. Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 on public transportation; whereas, rural counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, road maintenance, sewage disposal, and water supply.

County leaders differed in their ratings of six areas with regard to community facilities and services between urban counties in 1979 and 1984. In 1979, urban counties' public transportation was rated higher than in 1984; whereas, fire protection, garbage and trash disposal, public buildings, road maintenance, and sewage disposal were rated higher in 1984 urban counties than in 1979. No significant differences were found in the ratings of water supply over the two time periods.

Family living. Leaders in 1979 and 1984 rural counties differed in their ratings of two areas included in family living. Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 on family income; whereas, condition of homes were rated significantly higher in 1984 than in 1979. No significant differences were found between the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties on the area of family living conditions.

On the other hand, the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties on two out of three areas were significantly different. Urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on condition of homes and family living conditions. No significant differences existed in the ratings of family income in urban counties over time.

Health and education. Significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 rural counties in each of all seven areas with regard to health and education. Leaders in rural counties rated the areas (availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, availability of public health services, education, nursing homes, public libraries, and school buildings) higher in 1984 than in 1979.

Leaders in urban counties rated six of the seven areas significantly different in 1979 and 1984. Urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on availability of doctors and dentists, availability of hospitals and clinics, education, nursing homes, public libraries, and school buildings. No significant differences were found in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties on availability of public health service.

Recreational and general community environment. The rural county leaders' ratings of four areas with regard to recreational and general community environment were significantly different in 1979 and 1984. Rural counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 with regard to conservation of natural resources; whereas, rural counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on community organizations, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunity for all ages. No significant differences were found in the ratings of land use planning and zoning in 1979 adn 1984 rural counties.

There was only one area in which 1979 and 1984 urban counties were rated significantly different. Urban counties in 1979 were rated

higher than in 1984 on community organizations. No significant differences were found in the ratings of conservation of natural resources, land use planning and zoning, parks and playgrounds, and recreational opportunities for all ages in the ratings of 1979 and 1984 urban counties.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the implications listed below were made:

1. Rural and urban counties were rated significantly different on 27 out of 32 community problem areas by all 12 groups of county leaders. Rural counties were rated higher than urban counties on only one area (sewage disposal); whereas, urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on the other 26 community problem areas. This finding implies that the quality and the conditions of community facilities and services were more adequate and in better conditions in urban counties than in rural counties.

2. Rural and urban counties were rated significantly different on 14 out of 32 community problem areas by five groups of leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences (significantly different in three or more groups of leaders). Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties on each of these 14 community problem areas. This finding implies that leaders belonging to Extension-related audiences in rural and urban counties were less likely to differ in their ratings of selected community problem areas. When they did differ, most of them regarded urban counties in better state of condition than

rural counties in terms of the quality and conditions of certain community facilities and services.

3. Rural and urban counties were rated differently on 27 community problem areas by all groups of leaders belonging to non-Extension-related audiences. Out of 27, only on 2 areas the ratings of rural counties were higher than urban counties (sewage disposal and nursing homes). The remaining 25 areas were rated higher in urban counties by non-Extension-related leaders. These findings imply that non-Extension-related leaders in rural and urban counties had a greater tendency to differ in their perception of selected community problem areas than Extension-related leaders. Urban counties were rated higher than rural counties with regard to a greater number of community problem areas as rated by non-Extension-related leaders compared to the ratings of Extension-related leaders. Non-Extension-related leaders regarded the quality and the conditions of community facilities in urban counties as better than in rural counties.

4. Rural counties in 1979 and 1984 were rated different as to 25 out of 28 community problem areas by all groups of leaders surveyed. In 1979, rural counties were rated higher than 1984 on eight areas; whereas, in 1984, rural counties were rated higher than 1979 on 17 areas. These findings imply that a number of community problem areas were improved interms of quality or condition from 1979 to 1984. Apparently a majority of the improvements were made in the area of health and education; whereas, no improvements were seen in the area of business, industry and employment. Urban counties in 1979 and 1984

were rated differently as to 19 out of 28 community problem areas by all groups of leaders surveyed. Urban counties in 1979 were rated higher than in 1984 on five areas; whereas, urban counties in 1984 were rated higher than in 1979 on 14 areas. These findings imply that some improvements in community problem areas in term of quality and condition were made in urban counties, especially in the area of health and education over the five year period. However, less improvement occurred in the area of recreational and general community environment.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Urban counties consistently were rated higher than rural counties, as to the quality and condition of community facilities and services by all leaders surveyed. Although more progress was made during the past five years in rural counties than in urban counties, it is suggested that the development gap between these two types of counties is still prevalent. For socio-economic and political stability, it is important to narrow the gap by speeding up rural community development. Extension services could play an important role by strenghtening their rural CRD programs by concentrating on areas that need the improvement. More cooperation in efforts and information by Extension services with other agencies which have direct responsibility for the problem areas is recommended.

VI. RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER STUDY

Hopefully this study will benefit future study in the community development program. This study provides superficial information on rural and urban counties' community needs for certain facilities and services. It is suggested that future studies explore the specific needs or problems that are indicated by the lower ratings in this study in order to find a solution for improvement which would be beneficial for CRD program planning. More objective and precise methods of obtaining information should be used.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Amonett, David Kelly. "A Comparison of Community Resource Development Problems as Perceived by Leaders in Rural and Urban Counties in Tennessee," Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1984.

2. Beale, Calvin L. "U.S. Population Trends Break With Past," Rural Development Prospectives, U.S.D.A./Economic Research Service, vol. 1 (February 1985).

3. Beegle, Allen J., Keith Bryant and Dale E. Hathaway. People of Rural America, A 1960 Census Monograph, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1968.

4. Bishop, C. E. and Fred A. Magnum. The Quality of Rural Living, Proceeding of a Workshop, Agricultural Board, Division of Biology and Agriculture National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.D., 1971.

5. Bogue, Donald J. and Calvin L. Beale. "Recent Population Trends in the U.S. and Their Causes," Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends, (Ed.) James H. Copp, Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1964.

6. Carlson, J. E. and Lasseys. Rural Society and Environment in America, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1981.

7. Davies, Vernon. "Development of a Scale to Rate Attitude of Community Satisfaction," Rural Sociology, X (September 1945), pp. 246-255.

8. Dillman, Don A. and Kenneth R. Tremblay, Jr. "The Quality of Life in Rural America," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 429, January 1977.

9. E.C.O.P. Subcommittee on CRD and Public Affairs. Program Directions for the 1980s Extension Community Resource Development, February 1983.

10. Ford, Thomas R., (Ed.) Rural U.S.A. Persistence and Change, Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1978.

11. Fitzsimmons, Stephen J. and Abbey J. Freedman. Rural Community Development. A Program, Policy, and Research Model, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt. Bood, 1981.

12. "Glossary of Frequently Used Agricultural Extension Terms." The University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service, TAEE 004.

13. Hynson, Lawrence M., Jr. "Rural-Urban Differences in Satisfaction Among the Elderly," Rural Sociology, XXXX, (Spring 1975), 64-66.

14. Jesser, Clinton J. "Community Satisfaction Patterns of Professionals In Rural Areas," Rural Sociology, XXXII, (March 1967), 56-69.

15. Johnson, Ronald and Edward Knop. "Rural-Urban Differentials In Community Satisfaction," Rural Sociology, XXXV, (December 1970), 544-548.

16. Lowe, George D. and Thomas K. Pinkey. "Rural-Urban Differences In Support for Environmental Protection," Rural Sociology, Vol. 47 (Spring 1982), 114-128.

17. Miller, Michael K., Donald E. Voth and Diana M. Danforth. "The Medical Care System and Community Malady: Rural, Urban and Sub-Urban Variations In Impact," Rural Sociology, Vol. 47 (Winter 1982), 634-654.

18. Miller, Machael K. and Kelly W. Crader. "Rural Urban Differences In Two Dimensions of Community Satisfaction," Rural Sociology, Vol. 44 (Fall 1979), 489-504.

19. "Position Statement - Resource Development Section," Community Resource Development Fact Sheet, University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service.

20. Rogers, Everett M. and Rabel J. Bundge. Social Change In Rural Societies, New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1972.

21. "The Role and Responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service In Community Development," Community Resource Development Fact Sheet, University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service.

22. "Rural Housing--Misery persists as federal funds slow to a crawl," The Knoxville News-Sentinel, Sunday, September 22, 1985, p. F1, F6.

23. Sanders, Irwin T. Rural Society, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

24. Southern Association of Agriculture Scientists. Rural Sociology In the South: 1980, A Collection of Papers from the 1980 Meeting of the Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, February 3-6, 1980, Hot Spring, Arkansas.

25. "Trend Reverses; Urban areas out-growing countryside," The Knoxville Journal, November 21, 1985, p. A5.

26. Tweeter, Luther and George L. Brinkman. Micropolitan Development, Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1976.

27. University of Tennessee, Agricultural Economic and Resource Development Department. Resource Development Newsletter, No. 106 (June 1980).

28. Welling, M. Gist. "An Overview of CRD for Tennessee Extension Staff," Resource Development Fact Sheet, University of Tennessee, Agricultural Extension Service.

APPENDIX

University of Tennessee
Agricultural Extension Service
1984 COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Audience _____
County _____

As a community leader, you are being asked to help the county Agricultural Extension Service determine the major areas of local concern. Please complete the following checklist, as you believe the average resident sees our county, by circling poor, fair or good for each item. Add others we may have overlooked.

Local Agriculture Poor Fair Good	Education Poor Fair Good	Sewage Disposal Poor Fair Good	Availability of Doctors and Dentists Poor Fair Good	Condition of Homes Poor Fair Good	Citizen Participation in Local Government Poor Fair Good
Local Industry Poor Fair Good	Public Libraries Poor Fair Good	Water Supply Poor Fair Good	Availability of Hospitals and Clinics Poor Fair Good	Parks and Playgrounds Poor Fair Good	General Community Appearance Poor Fair Good
Local Stores Poor Fair Good	School Buildings Poor Fair Good	Garbage and Trash Disposal Poor Fair Good	Nursing Homes Poor Fair Good	Recreational Opportunities for All Ages Poor Fair Good	Other _____ Poor Fair Good
Sources of Credit Poor Fair Good	Public Buildings Poor Fair Good	Road Maintenance Poor Fair Good	Family Living Conditions Poor Fair Good	Land Use Planning and Zoning Poor Fair Good	Other _____ Poor Fair Good
Jobs Available Poor Fair Good	Fire Protection Poor Fair Good	Public Transportation Poor Fair Good	Family Income Poor Fair Good	Conservation of Natural Resources Poor Fair Good	Other _____ Poor Fair Good
Job Training and Retraining Poor Fair Good	Police Protection Poor Fair Good	Availability of Public Health Services Poor Fair Good	Children's Day Care Poor Fair Good	Community Organizations Poor Fair Good	Other _____ Poor Fair Good

Please identify the top three specific problems: 1. _____, 2. _____, and 3. _____. This information will give us a basis for educational programs in community resource development. Please list the top three opportunities for Extension programs related to our county: 1. _____, 2. _____, and 3. _____ (Use the back of this form if you need more space to express your opinion on any item.) Thank you.

VITA

Shamsuddin bin Ahmad was born on February 7, 1954 in the state of Kelantan, West Malaysia. He is third in a family of eight.

He attended the College of Agriculture, Malaysia in the 1971-72 session and graduated with a diploma in Animal Health and Production in 1976.

He accepted his first assignment as an Agriculture Assistant at the Center for Extension and Continuing Education, University of Agriculture, Malaysia. He was responsible for livestock Extension works at the university adopted Extension areas.

In 1982, he received a federal scholarship for further study in the United States. He attended The University of Tennessee, Knoxville and graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Animal Science in March 1984. Two years later he completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree in Agricultural Extension at the same university.